



## WHAT KIND OF LABOUR PEDAGOGY IS NEEDED TODAY?

Waldemar Furmanek

ORCID: 0000-0002-1032-4266

University of Rzeszów

e-mail: furmanek@ur.edu.pl

**Keywords:** man, work, working man, labour pedagogy, paradigms, humanistic pedagogy of work

**Abstract.** In the article, I point out to whom work pedagogy is needed. These are: human researchers, educators, teachers, parents and students, as well as all those interested in education. I consider work to be a basic form of activity exclusively for human beings. Because of its change-making power, it should be used by pedagogues in educational processes. **Only man works.** The necessity of research in the field of work issues also stems from the researchers' aspiration to understand the **essence of man** and their humanity. There is a widespread expectation for the modernisation of work pedagogy. However, the directions of this modernisation vary. In this paper I point out the need to build a humanistic pedagogy of work adopting a homocentric point of view in the research problematic.

### JAKA PEDAGOGIKA PRACY JEST OBECNIE POTRZEBNA?

**Słowa kluczowe:** człowiek, praca, pracujący człowiek, pedagogika pracy, paradygmaty, humanistyczna pedagogika pracy

**Streszczenie.** W artykule wskazuję na to, komu potrzebna jest pedagogika pracy. Są to: badacze zajmujący się problematyką człowieka, pedagodzy, nauczyciele, rodzice i uczniowie, a także wszyscy interesujący się edukacją. Pracę uznaję za podstawową formę aktywności **wyłącznie człowieka**. Z uwagi na jej zmianotwórczą moc powinna być wykorzystywana przez pedagogów w procesach edukacji. Tylko człowiek pracuje. Niezbędność badań w zakresie problematyki pracy wynika także z dążeń badaczy do zrozumienia **istoty człowieka** i jego człowieczeństwa. Powszechne jest oczekiwanie na unowocześnienie pedagogiki pracy. Kierunki tegoż unowocześniania są jednak różne. W prezentowanym opracowaniu wskazuję na potrzebę budowy humanistycznej pedagogiki pracy przyjmującej homocentryczny punkt widzenia w problematykę badań.

## Introduction

In my thinking – as a labour pedagogue – the following questions are increasingly coming up: Who might need work pedagogy? Is a pedagogy of work needed today? Does work really have the power to create personality? If so, what kind of **work pedagogy** do we expect? Goals are set and realised according to needs; then they become instruments for effective action. These in turn are inscribed in the mission and vision of work pedagogy (Furmanek, Tomaszewska, in print).

Answering the above questions requires reflection on a preconception: **the work of every human being is not only an existential necessity, but it is a good of humanity, which they should share with other people.** Such understanding of work results in the conviction that there is a change-making power in work, which should be used by pedagogues in their pedagogical activity. From this assumption, it follows that the answer to the question of the need for scientific research included in the pedagogy of work involves some understanding of the essence of man and the meaning of the work they undertake.

Undoubtedly, the contemporary pedagogy of work is indispensable for **researchers of pedagogical problems** searching for such pedagogical solutions, which would most fully and effectively realize the basic functions and tasks of pedagogical sciences. This means those who are in line and remain in connection with the tasks and mission of pedagogical sciences. Developing the **self-awareness of the researchers “practising” work pedagogy** – synonymous with maturity and inner depth – belongs to the priority tasks of contemporary pedagogy.

In this case, the fundamental task is to **help people to become capable and willing participants** in work, who will find the meaning of life through participation in work processes and who will derive their enjoyment of life (happiness) from making worthwhile use of the achievements of civilisation. In connection with the goal formulated in this way, a catalogue of more specific tasks can be mentioned:

1. Supporting professional development processes in connection with natural development processes.
2. Planning and correcting development processes.
3. Supporting the integral development personal dispositions of humans.
4. Preventing threats to personal development associated with processes of participation in work phenomena.

**The pedagogy of work, through the results of its research, is needed by politicians and organisers of educational structures,** for whom the well-being of human beings, the well-being of the young generation, is a special value. By exploiting the axiological potential of any work, they should, first of all bring about an understanding of the fact that by discovering the meaning of work, at the same time, we discover the meaning of life. Work is the most significant terrain of human activity in which man realises the fullness of their axiological space. It is an activity aimed at improving the world and humans. Through their activities, they should provide the conditions to secure people (especially young people) against civilisational exclusion and unemployment. Parents are also needed to show their children the existential significance of work. They should make it clear that work is regarded as a need of every human being, and that it cannot be an unwanted necessity and a difficult duty to accept. By understanding the meaning of work, children will already appreciate that through work and at work, humans have the chance to effectively realise the processes of development of their humanity; to achieve personal and community success; to change the quality of their lives.

**The pedagogy of work is needed for adults regardless of their age of life;** therefore it should show the existential meaning and sense of work; thus it should contribute to the orientation of self-development so that every working person is able to integrate the meaning of work into the meaning of their lives.

**The results of research carried out in the field of work pedagogy can and should be useful for the young generation** entering the so-called adult life. Work pedagogy can help young people to self-evaluate their own talents and personal potential, to find their own adequate place in the world of work; to choose a profession and to support the whole educational path. So that they are able to cope with the difficulties that will arise in the dynamically changing labour market.

## **The most important assumptions**

The dynamic development of the human sciences, but also of other sciences interacting with pedagogy, enforces the necessity of constant redefinition of the basic methodological assumptions of pedagogical disciplines. This requires a reinterpretation of the research subject, modification of the research objective and introduction of new methodological solutions.

- A. A. Let us note, however, that the same questions are asked by all pedagogues, including pedagogues of other pedagogical specialities. The answer to the questions posed must be formulated in connection with the answers to these questions addressed to pedagogues in general. In particular, the question about **the research object** of general pedagogy and work pedagogy should be mentioned. Undoubtedly it is **the human being**. The question, however, is how to perceive this distinguished object of research<sup>1</sup>. Who is a human? What are their constitutive properties? We cannot overlook here the relation of pedagogy to the philosophy of man.
- B. B. The mission of the pedagogical sciences is to **support man in their systematic efforts to develop their humanity** (Furmanek, Tomaszewska in print).

Pedagogues are aware that the prerequisite for human development is human activity. Therefore, they strive in their research to determine the change-forming power of various environments and forms of human activity. This includes determining the function of work in the processes of upbringing. We assume that work is a fundamental ethical force and value and that we direct pedagogical activity towards introducing the pupils to the world of values.

- C. C. The multidimensionality of the area of interest of pedagogues naturally led to the differentiation and separation of various departments, sub-disciplines, currents and pedagogical orientations. The multidimensional and lifelong development of a human being requires the activity of an individual in various educational environments. Irrespective of the educational environment, the forms of action taken by an active person in this environment are important.

The point is that even here we do not have an unambiguous terminological convention. What are the criteria for classifying these forms of activity or action? Because, for example, from the point of view of cognitive activities, we can distinguish the following activities: sensory, motor, intellectual, receptive, verbal, and emotional... From the point of view of forms of human activity, we can talk about: learning, working, resting, playing, fighting, and lazing. Let us note that already these exemplary classifications of human activity interrelate. It would be difficult to describe human work (of any kind) solely by, for example, motor activity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Beware of the so-called *anthropological error*.

We come to another way of distinguishing the domains of upbringing. These are the domains of **upbringing** through, for example, sport, music, and work... and the domains of **upbringing for**... family life, work, and profession... (Furmanek, Tomaszewska, in print).

In relation to each of the distinguished forms of activity and domains of activity, educators build various systems of judgments: descriptive, explanatory, praxeological, predictive, value judgments... „We are talking in this case about the theory of upbringing in the family, the theory of intellectual upbringing, the theory of upbringing through work, towards the values of work” (Furmanek, 2013, p. 32).

The distinction of areas of upbringing (which requires redefinition) facilitates the description of the subject and aim of research being the area of interest of a particular researcher. Nowadays, it is possible to speak about **distinguishing detailed areas of pedagogy**, which in the theory and practice of pedagogy appear under various names: vocational pedagogy, labour pedagogy, health pedagogy, recreational pedagogy, etc. All of them need some relatively permanent theoretical and methodological foundation. Their development is dependent on the development of general pedagogy. But it is also the other way round – the development of sub-disciplines often has a clear impact on the development of general pedagogy.

In this context, it is necessary to ask the question of whether the currently practised pedagogy of work uses the achievements of general pedagogy. Can it be considered a sub-discipline or an independent discipline in the family (system) of pedagogical sciences? (Furmanek, 2013).

## **Terminological convention**

For the description of the object of research of a scientific discipline, a terminological convention is essential. By the manner the basic categories of the scientific discipline of interest are understood, we can to a large extent indicate what methodological assumptions and thus what theoretical orientation certain texts present. For example, by defining the concept of *education as the formation of personality*, we enter the list of behaviourism or naturalism. The terminological convention of labour pedagogy needs to be constantly improved (Wolk, 2011). It is particularly important to define the different categories of work pedagogy, e.g. person, job, profession, and occupation.

Changes in the convention are correlated with civilisational changes, they are our everyday experience. We live in times of the formation of a new kind of civilisation. On the one hand, civilised, in the sense of valuing, we call such a society that allows each citizen to mature to personal fullness. On the other hand, the axiological space of the **new model of civilisation** is defined by information, data and knowledge. Competency in the use of knowledge is one of the key personal competencies that protect a person from **civilisational exclusion**. Hence, we call it information civilisation, within which structures of an *information society*, but also: a *knowledge society*, *informed society*, and *society of reason* are built (Wołk, 2006).

Key competencies stem from the technology that defines the model of civilisation (Furmanek, 2009). And this is where a difficulty arises. Well, we generally recognise that such key technologies are information technologies. The thing is that their ubiquity makes them permeate every other technology, modifying it and dynamising its development. This can be seen clearly in the examples of nanotechnology, biotechnology, cognitive technologies or disseminated information technologies.

The differentiation of civilisational change at the present stage is expressed, among other things, in the fact that it occurs in multiple ways. And today, we are unable to predict which technologies will dominate social life in the next few years.

## The research object of labour pedagogy

Zygmunt Wiatrowski points out that general pedagogy has both a narrow and abroad definition. In the broad sense, it is a traditionally understood discipline. In the narrow sense, it is classified as a sub-discipline of pedagogy, which is supposed to study basic methodological issues, and issues of institutional and personal representation (Wiatrowski, 2005). It is supposed to constitute a basic system of pedagogical concepts and claims. Labour pedagogy remains in connection with general pedagogy. This concerns first of all the basic theoretical and methodological assumptions.

There is no need to justify the obvious statement that the basic object of interest of labour pedagogy is the **working human being** (Furmanek, 2019). Both components of this concept, i.e. **man and work**, should be the object of systematic and continuous research of the representatives of labour pedagogy.

**Work**, as understood by labour pedagogues, is an existential necessity of man, it has the power **to improve man** and their environment. Hence, the necessity to use these potentials in pedagogical activity. In order to understand the phenomena constituting the objects of interest of labour pedagogy, it is necessary to explain how labour pedagogues understand the **essence of man** and how they understand the **essence of work**. I start from the assumption derived from the systemic approach that: it is **impossible to understand the essence of work without first understanding the essence of the human being**. A discussion of the relevant phenomena describing human work is the subject of many publications (see bibliography); after all, only humans work. Despite this, further studies are still required.

## Human

The model of a human being taken as a basis for analysis impinges on the whole issue of pedagogy, including labour pedagogy. For the purposes of humanistic labour pedagogy, we adopt a **personalistic conception of the human being** (cf. the series of works by Furmanek, 1995, 2017, 2018). It is a perfectionist conception, assuming that a human being in the whole course of his or her life strives (and should strive) to realise the recognised and accepted most important dimensions of their humanity (Furmanek, 1995, 2018).

It is a truism to state that **a man is the object of study of the pedagogical sciences**. It is no less a cliché to state that man is a special being on earth. The reflection on the essence of man as a special being, a being of a specific kind has accompanied researchers, not only pedagogues, for a long time. It is of fundamental importance in the fields of philosophy and anthropology, but also in ethics and metaphysics, which seek answers to questions about the nature of man.

The adoption of certain assumptions of human philosophy is a necessary and indispensable prerequisite for the meaningfulness of any analysis concerning man (Furmanek, 2018). Adopted in humanistic labour pedagogy, **adequate anthropology** is based on the truth about man and the world around them, which contributes to their liberation. This conception of anthropology carries *the timeless truth of the human being as such, the human being who is who they are and as they are, regardless of the conditions of life, the possibilities of action and post-knowledge* (Mruszczyk, 2010, p. 9).

These answers are in close relation to the questions posed by educators about **how to become human, and how to make a being become human** (Łakomski,

2004). It is now thought that a philosophical and axiological concept of **humanity** is helpful in formulating answers to these questions. While recognising that humanity most clearly describes the axiological identity of a human being, the use of this term makes it possible to clarify the pedagogical questions mentioned above: **How to describe the humanity of a human being? How to understand its essence? How to realise humanity? How to build up humanity in a man? What dangers are there in the process of developing this humanity?** Questions about the essence of man also require a critical-creative reflection on the research methodology used in pedagogical sciences in relation to this particular slice of reality. The consequence of such a solution is the adoption of an **integral human model** (Furmanek, 2019).

## Work

Nowadays, **work as a basic form of activity of an existential nature is an important ethical force**. As a value inscribed in the personal value space, it **modifies the relations existing between the different axiological categories**. Hence, it is extremely important to expressly emphasise the **primacy of man over their work**. The consequences of the adopted paradigm are significant for the definition of the object and purpose of the research, for man is both the creator of work and the consumer of the results of work; man, as a person who acts (*I act*), becomes a more and more perfect person by being it. Work perfects a man. At the same time, it perfects the world in which its subject and creator live (Furmanek, 2009).

A personalistic (humanistic) description of the human person's work – as opposed to a mechanistic view of work<sup>2</sup> – includes:

- emphasising the autonomy of the human being as revealed in their conduct (after all, work is a nexus of conduct),
- exposing the constitutive characteristics of the human person (dignity, freedom, responsibility of the working man),
- treating human beings as co-participants in the processes of creation (seeing human beings as partners with God),
- the realisation that work is a way to improve oneself as a creator of work,

---

<sup>2</sup> The catalogue of characteristics of work in the mechanistic view includes: man's behaviour towards the world; man's inexhaustibility as a motive for work; man's aspirations to subjugate the world; the indirect satisfaction of man's needs; the contradictory nature of its parameters: toil – ease; necessity – freedom; suffering – joy; the productive character of work.



- recognition of work as a voluntary act, resulting from man's awareness and freedom,
- recognition of work as a source of values that are important in a person's life and important for their further development.

Work is the good of man, the **good** of their humanity, as John Paul II wrote in his encyclical on work (John Paul II, 1991). And, as St. Thomas wrote: the good does not usually break through on its own but requires man's involvement, it **requires effort, and it requires a realisation** of the encounter with all the difficulties of realising the good. According to St Thomas, to grow in wisdom, four conditions are needed: a) **listening** (*libenter audiat*) – to listen attentively; b) **inquiring** (*diligenter inquirat*) – to inquiring diligently; c) **conversing/discussing/dialogue** (*prudenter respondeat*) – to **respond** prudently; d) **reflecting/saving** things in memory/digesting what has been learned in truth (*attente meditetur*) (Mróz, 2007).

The changes taking place in modern times have also affected **human activity**, including work. Modern technologies make it necessary to rebuild all the components of the **man-work** system.

**From the point of view of agatology**, work is the good of man, the good of their humanity, for through work man externalises their potentialities and shows their entire subjective axiological space. Such a subjective approach to work is important because it is a person who, in their transgressive action, builds their new world, the world of things and products, the world of material and economic values. What drives a man to work is their nature. In activity, a person reveals their human potentialities most clearly. The nature and meaning of this activity is determined by its purposefulness. This, in turn, is not only linked to a person's freedom, but also to their rationality. Through work, a man both changes the quality of the world and, in a way, becomes more human themselves (John Paul II, 1991). Work concerns that which is morally beautiful and good in itself (*bonum honestum*). It is a so-called fair good (*bonum honestum*), that is, corresponding to human dignity, expressing, multiplying and affirming that dignity. Work is a useful or utilitarian good (*bonum utile*), and for many people, it is also a pleasant or hedonistic good (*bonum delectabile*), but also a burdensome good (*bonum arduum*). The question of the common good (*bonum communaee*) cannot be overlooked.

**From the point of view of arethology**, the work refers to the category of virtues. A person's virtues are syndromes of personal qualities that describe the quality of their spirituality. These are internal factors that improve the realisation

of moral good or evil; qualifications for moral human action; relatively constant fitness (improvements) for action towards good or evil.

In philosophy, the following virtues are distinguished: the virtues of reason (dianoetic), of scientific cognition; the moral virtues; the virtues of understanding (so-called intellectual intuition); the virtue of wisdom, of rational faculty, of prudence, of temperance, of fortitude, of justice, of friendship. Four of these are the cardinal virtues, from the Latin *cardinem*<sup>3</sup>. They are the pillars on which a person's character is based. Through their application, a truly human life is built. They include prudence (*prudentia*), justice (*iustitia*), fortitude (*fortitudo*) and temperance (*temperantia*). New areas of research into the aretological dimensions of contemporary human work are opening up before researchers in labour pedagogy.

**From the point of view of deontology**, we ask whether work is a curse or a blessing (Romaniuk 1997,). While “duty” (or command or injunction) means the necessity for a person to do something (to act in a certain way by internal order or by external order, e.g. legal, administrative), “duty” means primarily an obligation of a moral nature, i.e. an internal order. An obligation is a compulsion, an external impulse to act, whereas a duty is an injunction given to oneself. Viewed from the standpoint of the ethics of responsibility, one must point out that work is the terrain for realising the statement: “I act”. Humanity is in a sense identical to responsibility in the primary sense (Galarowicz, 1993).

**Responsibility** consists, most generally, of the fact that nurturers do not make a profession of it and are always ready to bear the consequences of their actions; it is considered to be at the core of everyone's moral experience (Furmanek, in print). Researchers of this problematic treat responsibility as a central phenomenon of the ethical sphere of man. It manifests itself in moral experience, i.e. experience in which man subjects the phenomena he encounters to value in terms of basic axiological categories<sup>4</sup>.

What is the responsibility of the working person? How is the research field of responsibility “for” and responsibility “towards” changing? The field of responsibility is at the same time an indicator of the maturity of the working man.

---

<sup>3</sup> The name “cardinal virtues” was first used by St Ambrose in his work *De officiis ministrorum* (written after 386). Before that, the virtues were called fundamental or general.

<sup>4</sup> In contemporary ethics, the category of responsibility has been quite well developed. Let us mention just a few authors. These include: Karol Wojtyła, Roman Ingarden, Friedrich König, Georg Picht, Józef Tischner, Jan Gala-rowicz, Tadeusz Styczeń, Tadeusz Kotarbiński.

## Paradigms of work pedagogy

Contemporary work pedagogy should be poly-paradigmatic (Furmanek, 2002). The prefix poly means multiple; a paradigm is a basic claim in the light of which the issues concerning the object of research of a given scientific discipline are studied and analysed. The adoption of a catalogue of explicitly defined paradigms is at the same time an indication of the purpose of research in labour pedagogy.

**The primacy of the human being overall phenomena** constituting the objects of interest of the pedagogical sciences (homocentrism) is indeed understood and in principle applied in the pedagogical community. However, the problem lies in the multiple interpretations of the concept of man. **What paradigms constitute in the research of pedagogy a reference** to the way of approaching the problems posed, and thus also capturing them according to the solution, thus dialectical (Platonic, Hegelian, Marxist dialectics), essentialist, idealist, existential, phenomenological, hermeneutic, etc.? (Walczak, 1952).

As we noted earlier: no matter the kind of work, it always involves **the whole person** (Strzeszewski, 1985). What does the phrase the whole person mean? An analysis of the transformations of work that have taken place over the course of the development of civilisation reveals a shift from an object-oriented to a subject-oriented view of the place of the human being in labour systems. At the same time, this points to the fact that further spheres of the human person have been activated at work. We are currently witnessing an intensification of the strain on the spiritual sphere of man (Chlewiński, 1979, p. 896). We speak of the **new work of man** (Furmanek, 2013).

The adopted philosophical conception of the working man – the conception of the working person – determines the basic assumptions of research methodology in contemporary labour pedagogy (Furmanek, 2014, p. 253 et seq.). Which paradigms is the reflection of the researcher of humanistic labour pedagogy oriented towards? Here are the most important ones:

- The primacy of the person over work, meaning that the person is the subject and creator of work (Furmanek, 2013).
- The primacy of the person over the technologies used in work (Furmanek, 2010, 2013).
- The working human is *a person by becoming* and *becomes by being a person* (Furmanek, 2018, p. 101).

- The contemporary realisation of the person's work is **an ethical category** (Furmanek, 2022, in print).
- Work is the terrain for the realisation of the entire axiological space of a person (Furmanek, 2020).

## The primacy of systems research

The adoption and application of the above-mentioned paradigms in research changes the problem grid of contemporary labour pedagogy. The changes run towards its humanistic theoretical and methodological orientation. Research of the system of problems of labour pedagogy requires **a systemic approach** (Duraj-Nowakowa, 1992a, 1992b). **A human being in the systemic approach is an organised and coherent structure of physical-psycho-spiritual subsystems**, i.e. the totality of organised dispositions and psychic processes, connected with the nervous system and the whole organism. In the model of the human being understood in such a way, one distinguishes the cognitive (informational) subsystem and the aspirational-emotional, or motivational subsystem. For both, the unifying function is performed by the conscious "I" (Chlewiński, 1997, p. 897). The mutual relations linking the above subsystems are of a feedback nature (Łakomski, 2004). Such an understanding of spirituality accepts the evolutionary hypothesis of the existence of something in the repertoire of human abilities that makes spiritual life possible. It is characterised by wholeness and a peculiar ordering (structurality).

**They can be studied using systems research methodology.** These characteristics are generally not attributed to material objects of reality, the study of which is most often carried out according to additive strategies, where the whole is treated as the sum of its parts. As a result of this, **the personalistic conception of man places the good and the lifelong development of the human person in the centre**, as we will write in further systematic analyses.

In the context of the good of the human being, we can say that values shape and perfect the human being; they correspond to his/her basic, spiritual dimensions (reason, will, sense of beauty) (Furmanek, 2005). Values are "ideal models of perfection of specific objects, which, reproduced in natural things, human works or human experiences", as Tadeusz Ślipko writes, "express their proper value, thanks to which they present themselves to man as better than others, are valued by them and trigger in them specific spiritual experiences and aspirations" (1974, p.17).

In what, then, is the **specificity of human research in the human sciences** expressed? It seems to be **spirituality and the spiritual life of the human being**. Spirituality accepts the evolutionary hypothesis of the existence in the repertoire of **human capacities for something**. It is worth adding that a specific dimension of the objects of humanities research is their sign-like, symbolic and sometimes mythological character. This is also where the difficulties of defining the boundaries of scientific and non-scientific cognition arise. This is where we enter the whole issue of value and the methodology of its research into humanistic studies. And here we perceive the difficulties in researching the problematic grid of contemporary pedagogy, including the pedagogy of work (Furmanek, 2006).

## **The primacy of a human over work**

*The primacy of man over work* is indeed a significant paradigm of humanistic labour pedagogy. It implies a **homocentric research objective**. In fact, it implies the primacy of the constitutive qualities of man over work, including the **primacy of human dignity over work**.

It also implies the assertion that *work is for man, and man is not for work*. This leads to the need to clarify our position on the essence of man. After all, it is impossible to understand the essence of human work without some understanding of man. Conversely, it is impossible to understand man without understanding their work. In other words, understanding the essence of human labour (in short, understanding labour) requires an understanding of man and, conversely, one can only understand man by understanding their labour.

Let us note that how we understand the need for labour pedagogy depends, in an ideological sense, on whether we consider pedagogical science to be social or humanistic. If we assume that pedagogy as a system of sciences belongs to the social sciences and deals with the development and changes in the mechanisms that build certain models of society corresponding to the challenges of civilisation and culture, then these sciences “construct the educational system” and propose solutions for the upbringing of a person so as to secure them from social, cultural and civilisational exclusion.

In our opinion, **pedagogy should be considered to be a system of human sciences**, because its primary object of interest is not so much society, but each individual human being, including the manifold active in society.

Today, the concept of the *new humanism* should be understood in broad, global dimensions, treated as a universal and all-human category, as a specific

programme of action for each individual human being. The content of the term humanism, so understood, will include various values and ideas, various forms of professional skills and ways of thinking, but all always subordinated to the good of man, actions on their behalf, guarantees of their existence and development, as actions in search of truth and love of beauty. In the content of the new humanism, we also find a place for both man's work and their technical activity. This makes it possible to postulate the necessity of introducing education towards the values of human labour into the system of general education. At the same time, it may be a proposal for solving the antinomy we are interested in within this study (Furmanek, 2000, 2003).

## Conclusions

The answer to the titular question turns out not to be so obvious. For we have not touched on many issues important for modelling the structure of the expected work pedagogy. After all, research into the mystery of the human being is conducted from very different points of view. For example, transhumanists want to **construct a new human** (post-human). This research ignores the paradigm requirement of the primacy of the human being and does not take into account the fact that the human being is an ethical entity. Will they too be willing and able to work? The same is true of the future of work. We have hitherto recognised that work is an existential value, conditioning “to be” (to exist) or “not to be” (not to exist) of man as a person. Will this truth about work continue? If there will be work, what kind of work will it be? Will there be a need to adopt humans for such work?

The questions that arise are not fiction; they concern the extremely important phenomena of the life of every human being. After all, their vocation is to make the earth subject to themselves.

## References

- Dec, I. (2003). *Humanizmy i ich roszczenia w wyjaśnianiu człowieka*. [In:] A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stępień (ed.), *Błąd antropologiczny*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu.
- Duraj-Nowakowa, K. (1992). *Modelowanie systemowe w pedagogice*. Kraków: Impuls.
- Duraj-Nowakowa, K. (1992). *Teoria systemów a pedagogika*. Kraków: Impuls.
- Furmanek, W. (2002). *Edukacja wobec poliparadygmatyczności nauk o niej*. [In:] G. Piotrowski i in. (ed.), *W kręgu edukacji, nauk o niej i społeczeństwa*. Poznań: UAM.

- Furmanek, W. (2003). *Poliparadygmaticzny charakter badań pedagogicznych*. [In:] J. Kuźma, J. Morbitzer (ed.), *Nauki pedagogiczne w teorii i praktyce edukacyjnej*. Kraków: AP.
- Furmanek, W. (2006). *Zarys humanistycznej teorii pracy*. Warszawa: IBE.
- Furmanek, W. (2009). *Edukacja a przemiany cywilizacyjne*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Furmanek, W. (2013). *Humanistyczna pedagogika pracy. Charakterystyka dyscypliny naukowej*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Furmanek, W. *Nowa praca człowieka w cywilizacji informacyjnej. Zarys problematyki*. Szkoła – Zawód – Praca, 7/8 (2014).
- Furmanek, W. (2016). *Nowa praca człowieka jako przedmiot badań humanistycznej pedagogiki pracy*. [In:] F. Szłosek (ed.), *Badanie. Dojrzewanie. Rozwój. Odrębność metodologiczna a dyscyplinarność danej dziedziny wiedzy*. Warszawa – Radom: ITeE-PIB.
- Furmanek, W. *Współczesność – zagrożenia świata wartości*. *Studia Paedagogica Ignatiana*, 1 (19). (2016).
- Furmanek, W. (2017). *Osoba podstawą antropologiczną humanistycznej pedagogiki pracy*. [In:] A. Solak, J. Bluszcz (ed.), *Personalizm pracy ludzkiej. Współczesne konotacje*. Warszawa: APS.
- Furmanek, W. (2018). *Człowiek jest osobą, stając się i staje się będąc nią*. [In:] M. Chrost, K. Jakubiak (ed.), *Wychowanie. Socjalizacja. Edukacja*. Kraków: Ignatianum.
- Furmanek, W. (2019). *Człowiek w badaniach współczesnej pedagogiki zorientowanej personalistycznie*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Furmanek, W. (2019). *Człowiek wobec wartości*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Furmanek, W. (2020). *Człowiek. Urzeczywistnianie się osoby*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Furmanek, W. (2020). *Godność człowieka. De dignitate personae humane*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Furmanek, W. (2021). *(Nie)Ład aksjologiczny wyzwaniem dla pedagogiki*. Rzeszów: UR.
- Furmanek, W., *Filozofia człowieka pracującego podstawą współczesnej pedagogiki pracy*. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska. Sectio J, Paedagogia-Psychologia*, 34 (4). (2021).
- Furmanek, W., Tomaszewska R. *The mission and vision of pedagogical science*. *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici*, 2 (2022).
- Galarowicz, J. (1993). *Powołani do odpowiedzialności. Elementarz etyczny*. Kraków: Oficyna Naukowa i Literacka.
- Godawa, G. *Integralna wizja człowieka jako fundament kultury i wychowania*, <http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl> (15.03.2022).
- Górniewicz, J. (1994). *Metodologiczne wyzwania dla teorii wychowania*. [In:] A.M. de Tchorzewski (ed.), *Z problematyki metodologicznej teorii wychowania*. Bydgoszcz: WSP.
- Jakubiak, K. (1994). *Rozumienie 'teorii wychowania' w polskiej myśli pedagogicznej XIX i początków XX wieku*. [In:] A.M. de Tchorzewski (ed.), *Z problematyki metodologicznej teorii wychowania*. Bydgoszcz: WSP.
- Jan Paweł II (1991). *Laboram exercens*. Watykan.
- Kwieciński, Z. *Pedagogizm – wariacje wokół rozumienia kategorii*, <https://przegladpedagogiczny.ukw.edu.pl/archive/article/358/pedagogizm---wariacje-wokol-rozumienia-kategorii/article.pdf> (15.03.2022).
- Kremień, W. (2008). *Filozofia edukacji*. Radom: ITeE.
- Liberska, H., Trempała, J. (ed.). (2020). *Psychologia wychowania. Wybrane problemy*. Warszawa: Wyd. Nauk. PWN.
- Mariański, J. (2022). *Godność ludzka a praca*. Lublin: KUL.

- Mróz, M. *Etyka wzrastania dziecka. Interpretacja pedagogiczno-moralna Puer Jesus św. Tomasza z Akwinu*. Paedagogia Christiana, 1 (19). (2007).
- Mruszczyk, M. (2010). *Człowiek w „antropologii adekwatnej” Karola Wojtyły*. Katowice: UŚ.
- Romaniuk, K. bp (1997). *Błogosławieństwo czy przekleństwo? Praca w Piśmie Świętym*. Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka.
- Strzeszewski, C. (1985). *Katolicka nauka społeczna*. Warszawa: Ośrodek Dokumentacji i Studiów Społecznych.
- Tomaszewska, R., (2021). *Człowiek i praca. Perspektywa transhumanizmu*. Bydgoszcz: UKW.
- Tchorzewski, A.M. (1994). *Dyskurs wokół paradygmatu teorii wychowania*. [In:] A.M. de Tchorzewski (ed.). *Z problematyki metodologicznej teorii wychowania*. Bydgoszcz: WSP.
- Tchorzewski, A. (ed.). (1994). *Z problematyki metodologicznej teorii wychowania*. Bydgoszcz: WSP.
- Walczak, S. (1952). *Moralna wartość pracy ludzkiej*. Praca doktorska. Lublin: KUL.
- Wiatrowski, Z. (2005). *Podstawy pedagogiki pracy*, ed. IV. Bydgoszcz: AB.
- Wołk, Z. *Aparat pojęciowy pedagogiki pracy. Niejednoznaczności i trudności definicyjne*. Szkoła – Zawód – Praca, 2 (2011).
- Wołk, Z. *Pedagogika pracy wobec zmian zachodzących w pracy zawodowej*. Problemy Profesjologii, 1 (2006).