

Humanitas University Research Papers. Pedagogy, pp. 97-109

Original article

Received: **15.02.2019**

Accepted: **27.03.2019**

Published: **10.06.2019**

Sources of financing the publication: **Humanitas University in Sosnowiec**

DOI: **10.5604/01.3001.0013.2209**

Authors' Contribution:

(A) Study Design

(B) Data Collection

(C) Statistical Analysis

(D) Data Interpretation

(E) **Manuscript Preparation**

(F) **Literature Search**

Aleksandra Kamińska*

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE ALFRED ADLER CONCEPT FOR THE ANALYSIS OF THE MEANING OF LIFE IN CONTEMPORARY PEDAGOGY

INTRODUCTION

Classically, looking at the history of the development of scientific reflection, the meaning of life was a concept reserved for philosophical reflection. It can be assumed that every philosophical thought referring to the functioning of man in the world, was concerned with the meaningfulness of his life (assumed a certain position in this respect), even if it did not use the concept. It was not until the mid-nineteenth century that social sciences such as psychology and sociology were distinguished from philosophy, gradually developing their own methodology. For psychology, which interests us in this article in a special way, the concept of the meaning of life is introduced in the first half of the twentieth century. For the first time in this field it was used by Sigmund Freud – creator of psychoanalysis, otherwise known as the first school of Viennese psychiatry. In this text, however, we are interested in the thought of the creator of the second school of Viennese psychiatry, i.e. the thought of Alfred Adler, who in the field of psychology created the first coherent concept referring to

* ORCID: 0000-0002-2536-3209. Humanitas University in Sosnowiec.

the meaning of life. In addition to this, the concept of the meaning of the life of the third school of Viennese psychiatry appeared, i.e. the thought of Viktor Emil Frankl – the creator of the so-called logotherapy and corresponding logotherapy.* The creators of the above schools knew their achievements well, because they were connected (at least to some time) by a master-student relationship: Sigmund Freud's student, for a moment considered his successor (after: Obuchowski, in Adler, 1986, p. 12), was Alfred Adler. In turn, V.E. Frankl was initially associated with the psychoanalytic school, then the Adler school, so that, as a result of his scientific research, he would create his own school based on his original concept.

The aim of this article is to focus on the analysis of Alfred Adler's views on the meaning of life and to isolate the themes relevant to contemporary pedagogy, in particular modern upbringing. This cannot be done without reference to the views of S. Freud, criticized by Adler, to which the first part of the article is devoted. The next part of the text is devoted to presenting the main elements of A. Adler's thought, while the last part is the conclusions for contemporary pedagogy.

The author decided to take up this topic due to the fact that the Adler school is today considered a classic thought of psychology, expressing the "spirit of its times," i.e. the interwar period. However, it is considered to be historical as many of the conclusions were not confirmed in subsequent findings in psychology. The second reason is the fact that Adler's thought in the context of the subject matter of the meaning of life is today mainly known through the criticism of these views formulated by V.E. Frankl. In the context of the meaning of life, the thought of V.E. Frankl, which was created just after Adler's concept, is considered to be valid until today, and it is almost impossible to take up this subject without referring to the author's thought, which is considered crucial in the discussed area. The author of the article does not claim that it is otherwise and does not devalue Frankl, but reading Frankl's presentation of Adler's thought and comparing it with the original works of this author led her to believe that Frankl unreasonably interpreted Adler's thought, attributing views, which Adler did not express himself. Because the main part of Frankl's thought was created just after the Second World War, and Adler died in 1937, he could not formulate a response to his criticism. In addition, as mentioned above, under the influence of Frankl's current thoughts, the main assumptions of Adler quickly lost their relevance, which led to his theory being no longer analyzed. However, according to the author of this article, it is worth returning to it, especially analyzing the notion

* The logotherapy and its corresponding logotherapy is the analysis of the spiritual (noological) dimension of humanity (Frankl 2012a, p. 43), the essence of which is striving for meaning. Logotherapy identifies specific elements that make up the theory of meaning in life, i.e. recognition of sense (the basic motivating force in a person's life, which is the striving to give sense to one's existence), self-sacrifice (realizing one's sense of life in certain life situations for the benefit of the outside world, and not realizing one's own selfish goals), values (of an internal nature, i.e. important for human beings, and not only known in the course of socialization) and human responsibility and freedom. In turn, logotherapy is according to Joseph B. Fabry: "healing through meaning" (after: Frankl, 2010, p. 21), or helping a lost man in discovering the meaning of his life (and not giving/discovering this sense for him).

of the meaning of life from the pedagogical perspective, because Adler attaches particular importance to man's education (mainly education within institutions such as kindergarten or school) in the context of realizing the meaning of human life. These elements were in turn bypassed by Frankl, i.e. his references to pedagogy or the importance of institutions bringing up the shaping and implementation of the meaning of human life are of a general nature. As part of logotherapy created by this author, they were developed only by his successors (e.g. in Poland by M. Wolicki (2007) or J. Michalski (2011)). Of course, this is not a complaint against V.E. Frankl, who was above all a psychiatrist, but it is worth considering this topic in the context of pedagogical thought. In connection with the above, in this article I will consider the conclusions that result from Adler's concept for contemporary pedagogy. In this field of knowledge – both in the theoretical and practical layers – the notion of the meaning of life is not precisely described, pushed to the margins of consideration, despite its key importance for humans (see, among others, Borowska, 2003; Orzelska, 2014).^{*} This concept belongs to the universal phenomena associated with human existence. It is important for people living in every historical period, although of course it is interpreted differently and implemented by them in particular aspects of their existence. The subject is also difficult for the author due to the heterogeneity of the views quoted and the assessment of their impact on today's reality.

NEGATION OF SIGMUND FREUD'S PSYCHOANALYSIS AS THE BASIS FOR FORMULATING THE MAIN ASSUMPTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY

As mentioned above, it was Sigmund Freud who first used the phrase "meaning of life" in psychology, but his position in this area was negative. He claimed: "When someone begins to ask about the meaning of life and death, it means that he is ill, because nothing like the meaning of life or the meaning of death is objectively existent" (after: Mazanka, 2000, p. 121). Although Freud "was the first in psychology to ask the question about the meaning of life," he did not give a satisfactory answer

^{*} The authors mentioned in the footnote indicate the marginalization not only of the notion of the meaning of life in pedagogy, but also of other existential concepts. The position of J. Spletana (2015, p. 16) belongs to the rarity. She writes: "Both theoretical reflections and the sphere of educational practice, focusing on the analysis of phenomena in the basic dimensions of human life: social, cultural, family or health, more and more often direct their attention to issues of dilemmas and existential questions. In the field of non-specific interests of pedagogical research, there is the issue of the existential condition of modern man with its component in the form of the issue of the essence of life." This position was further strengthened in the author's latest position, where we find, among others the following statement: "For both new social movements, information breakthrough and progress in the field of education and formation of the young generation do not separate from fundamental questions about the meaning of existence, thus the sphere is still an essentially sanctioned area whose negation would lead to denial of the existence of man as a being lifted to a sense called the «all-encompassing»" (Spletana, 2018, p. 11).

(Teodorczuk, 2015, p. 140). In his opinion, the only purpose of human life is to pursue towards death. The key to his deliberations was the concept of human striving for the so-called homeostasis, i.e. man as such – in his opinion – constitutes a battlefield of contradictory drives. These drives allow people to meet their needs. Thus, the basic motivating force of a person to act is the so-called the “principle of pleasure,” as a result of which man avoids suffering. Everything that a person creates (e.g. culture, own thoughts) is a side effect of these aspirations. This view became the basis of criticism of Freud and psychoanalysis by the creators of the other schools who accused him of:

- creating a vision of a human being as a ruthlessly subordinated to drives, determined by them and unable to free themselves from them (Frankl, Adler), by which man becomes an “automatically acting spiritual apparatus” (Frankl, 2012a, p. 40);
- objectivity, which leads to the depersonalization of man (Frankl), does not take into account his individuality, does not imply significant personal attributes (Adler);
- assigning life failures of the unconsciousness or fighting of internal forces (Adler, Frankl);
- recognition that a mentally ill person can be helped by perfect mastery of psychotherapeutic techniques that are absolutely effective for every human being (Adler, Frankl);
- incorrect explanation of the Oedipus complex, the concept of libido, etc.

In the existing literature on the subject, however, it is emphasized that researchers analyzing the meaning of life did not fully deal with Freud’s concept, choosing only some elements which then they criticized (Teodorczuk, 2015, p. 144). In this way, they do not refer, for example, to the concept of libido, the meaning of dreams, death or the essence of the language lapses.

As for the pedagogical reference, included in this text, psychoanalysis also dominated in pedagogy. This is due to the fact that until the mid-1970s, so-called a reductionist position towards man is adopted, and behaviorism is the dominant current along with psychoanalysis. This position, which is at the core of psychological considerations, is also adopted and implemented in pedagogy. From this it follows that man – as subjected, for example, to drives, is not free, autonomous, self-controlling (Dobroczyński, 2009, p. 10), but is reduced to a specific aspect, in this case a biological one. Just like a psychologist has a specific set of techniques that helps a patient, so a pedagogue uses a specific set of techniques to “tame” the pupil, reducing negative in his opinion aspects of characters and strengthening positive ones, that is, ignoring and smothering his or her individuality.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY OF ALFRED ADLER

The very creation of individual psychology by Alfred Adler is of pedagogical importance, because his contribution to psychology consists in the recognition of man as an individual and unique being. Even if we create certain theories that explain the existence of a human being as a species, emphasizing certain regularities characteristic of people, this does not exempt the researcher from critically referring these theories to actually existing people. Each person is, by its nature, a “one-time” being, and thus it is impossible to have psychological rules and principles (or those having its source in any field of knowledge) that would be able to express the fullness of humanity. These theories are only means to help the researcher understand a human being. The community develops, striving for its better and better form.

“The meaning of human life is hidden in community life, i.e. the community as a whole has its hidden, secret and unobvious goal to which it is heading. It is based on a certain assumption that the animated world is subject to creative evolution aiming at the best possible functioning” (Teodorczuk, 2015, p. 145). Man can act in accordance with the goals of the community and then he realizes a life full of sense, or his actions can be directed against the community, then man harms himself and has a problem in finding himself in the surrounding social conditions, adaptation to them, and thus realizing the meaning of his life. Thus – says Kazimierz Obuchowski: “The meaning of life, just as it is understood [by Adler – note A.K.] is not an unique concept that gives the individual a sense his own effort. It is the law of life, the duty to act for the benefit of others” (Obuchowski, in Adler, 1986, p. 10). Each individual person may participate in this process or deny it, taking action against the community. In this evolutionary goal, which the community aspires to, ethics is hidden among others. Good human behavior, i.e. consistent with the needs of the community, which fits into its direction of development, is ethical. Everything that serves it has such a character. “«Why should I love my neighbor» – the answer is due to the inseparable communication between people and inexorably the ideal of community that guides us” – Adler writes (1986, p. 160), in another place, stating: “Such orders as: «Do not kill» or «Love your neighbor» must never disappear from knowledge and feeling as the supreme instance. These and other norms of human relationships, the undeniable results of human evolution, anchored in human nature, like breathing and a simple walk, can be grasped in the concept of an ideal human society, considered here purely scientifically as an evolutionary necessity and an evolutionary goal” (Adler, 1986, pp. 50-51). In turn, a person who does not fall into accordance with the aims of the community – errs. He hurts both the community as a whole and himself. Because the location of the meaningfulness of individual human life in the context of its implementation in accordance with the concept of the evolution of the whole community is based on the whole concept of individual psychology, what

strikes is the axiomatic element in Adler's mind, i.e. I have found no justification for this belief in any of his works. Adler does not refer to other researchers and their findings at all, e.g. in contrast to Frankl's concept, his is not grounded in philosophical achievements.* The more this belief is incomprehensible, especially for modern man. Perhaps this lack corresponds to Obukowski's "superficiality" of Adler's philosophical education (Obuchowski, in Adler, 1986, p. 25).

Man's task is therefore to act in accordance with the needs of the community. The existence of humans – what is important for pedagogues – is the potential human development. Adler's man is a being striving for perfection on the basis of given conditions. Man has a feeling of incompetence from his birth, which he wants to overcome – in this way he develops. Then, there are many obstacles in his way of life. If a man overcomes them in harmony with the community – he develops, if not – he experiences problems. This inclination and ability of a man to overcome failures, in my opinion, is the basic motivating force of a person to act. In this respect, I do not agree with Frankl's assumptions prevailing in contemporary literature on this subject that the will to power is dominant in Adler's man, resulting in the fact that man seeks to rule the world and gain advantage over others. In Adler there is such a theme, called the superiority complex, but in all the works of Adler (1946, 1986, 2016, no year of publication) translated into Polish, it is criticized by him as incompatible with the spirit of community action.

Man realizes the meaning of his life in three basic areas: attitudes towards others, love and work. This is where the relationship between a human being and the social group in which he functions is expressed – his passion or lack of interest in other people. Other interests and duties of a person result from these (e.g. friendship, companionship, patriotism, respect for the opposite sex, etc.) (Adler, 2016, p. 34).

Of particular importance for pedagogy is Adler's understanding of childhood. Adler's views in this aspect can be described in one sentence: everything depends on our childhood; more specifically, whether a person behaves in accordance with the requirements of the community or whether he is against it is shaped during his childhood. From an early age, a child is subjected to the influence of stimuli from the environment and based on how he reacts to them in the first years of his life, up to the age of 5; the lifestyle is shaped that is dominant in his actions and relatively stable. Man reacts to most events, situations that appear in his life in accordance with the lifestyle that developed in him under the influence of the first reactions in childhood. As a result of their repetition, a lifestyle is shaped in every human being, under the influence of which a person almost automatically, using the same pattern, reacts to particular situations. Thus, the pattern of life is associated with the character of man (Adler, no year of publication). As a result of the repetition and shaping of this pattern in adulthood: "Most people are not aware of the goal that they strive

* In Frankl's concept, we find many philosophical references, including to the classics, like Saint Augustine, B. Pascal, F. Nietzsche, M. Scheler, and contemporary philosophers, e.g. M. Heidegger, M. Buber, and others.

for in life” (Adler, no year of publication, p. 21). The human life style is relatively permanent, because man is basically unable to discover and thus change the patterns of his own behavior – he needs external help, that is help of individual psychologists (Adler, no year of publication), or psychologists trained under the assumptions of this psychology of teachers and educators (Adler, 1946).

The last of the elements of Adler’s concept important for the reflection of pedagogy is his approach to upbringing. The views on man’s upbringing are partly consistent with modern knowledge in the field of socialization of man, which we currently divide most often into primary socialization (which takes place primarily in the family) and secondary socialization, during which we are able to question some of the patterns that have been passed on to us during primary socialization (Karkowska, 2009). Adler does not use the term socialization, but he devotes a lot of space to the impact of primary socialization on the shaping of a child’s lifestyle. It focuses here on parenting in the family, and above all on the mistakes parents can make in the upbringing. The first person who has a significant impact on raising a child is the mother, then – in accordance with the rules of modern socialization – the circle of influence expands, i.e. the father, other close family members, neighbors, and acquaintances and, finally, care and educational institutions including school. In family education, Adler stresses the mistakes that will have a negative impact on the child’s lifestyle, and consequently on his adult behavior. Among many errors, he mentions lack of satisfying the emotional needs of the child (parents’ frigidity), but equally erroneous opinion of the described psychologist is to devote too much attention to the child, too much time, as a result of which the child creates the belief that he is the most important element of the world and other strangers should sacrifice so much attention as parents and focus only on the fulfillment of his needs. An illness of a child is an equally difficult topic. On the one hand, we can deal here with inborn defects, as a result of which children with developmental problems (developing later than their peers) feel less valuable. On the other hand, devoting too much time to the child during illness can lead to spoiling him, which will make it more difficult for him to develop later.

According to Obuchowski, Adler was a “passionate pedagogue and a psychologist of choice” (Adler, 1986, p. 10), which is clearly visible in his views on school education and the role of teacher in this education (Adler, 1946; Markinówna, 1935; Rondthaler, 1930). According to him, the school is the last place in the context of the process of human development, which is able to, and thus has the duty to correct family errors in raising a child. Therefore, Adler recommends that teachers observe children both in terms of their education and behavior in the group (behavior in play, the ability to cooperate with colleagues), so that they can eventually correct their typical behavior in children, which are the result of family errors in the upbringing.

CONCLUSIONS FROM ALFRED ADLER'S THOUGHT FOR CONTEMPORARY PEDAGOGY

From the above – due to the framework of the study – briefly presented reasoning; the following conclusions can be drawn.

The Adler school is already historic today. Adler is currently presented as the so-called “the first” in psychology, which means that his contribution to the development of psychological thought (also highlighted in this text) was considered significant, but it did not stand the so-called “the test of time.” Also in the pedagogical aspect, his thought, developed in Poland primarily by Elżbieta Markinówna (1935) and Adolf Rondthaler (1930), belongs to the past. His views are impossible to maintain, for example regarding the unconscious direction in which the community aspires, or views on spirituality connected with human corporeality. It is difficult to accuse Adler of some of his views, having at our disposal almost 100 years of later psychological achievements, because analyzing them, one must bear in mind the knowledge that the author had and the conditions in which he functioned.

Author's criticism is formulated only in terms of its predecessors, i.e. Adler criticizes Freud, and Frankl – both Freud and Adler. In the scientific literature, there is no discussion between them; the authors do not formulate arguments for *ad vocem*. First of all, I am talking about the debate between Freud and Adler, because it was impossible between Adler and Frankl. Frankl's main works appeared just after the Second World War, while Adler died before the war in 1937 and, as Kazimierz Obuchowski writes, his life passed in the shadow of Freud (Obuchowski, in Adler, 1986, pp. 14-15). In the case of references to Freud, the quality/type of this criticism also deserves attention. In his publications, Adler refers many times to Freud directly and indirectly, each time criticizing his views. According to Obuchowski: “[...] Adler never freed himself from Freud. At times, it seems that, according to Adler, there is only one man in the history of thinking about a human being who errs, wanders and was never right. It was Sigmund Freud” (in Adler, 1986, p. 14). And indeed, when reading Adler, one can get the impression of Adler being ferocious with Freud. At the same time, it seems that Adler appreciated Freud as a scientist, writing for example: “It seems that Freud knew a lot more than he understood” (Adler, 2016, p. 211).

The significance attributed by Adler to childhood is worth emphasizing. Treating childhood as a special period in a person's life is already a norm today, in contrast to dominant views up to the 17th century that a child is a miniature of an adult (see Aries, 2000). However, it is difficult to say today that the foundations of sensible life shape precisely in this period. Today, according to knowledge from developmental psychology, it is assumed that childhood is a period of adaptation to the conditions of the social world, and the essence of this adaptation is its unquestioning, accepting it as it is. It is a period of so-called secondary socialization (Karkowska, 2009), in which a man, having the necessary background acquired in primary socialization,

is able to question its individual elements. In this process, the question of value is important – not so much the values accepted by society and learned, but values internalized, fully accepted (Frankl, 2017; Mariański, 1990). Hence, according to modern knowledge about socialization, the shaping of the concept of life is different than that of Adler, in which it means complete acceptance of the goals and values of community, but the individual shaping of the meaning of life takes place in some opposition to them, often questioning some of them.

The views of Adler on the role of childhood in the life of a man and the position of a child are similarly revealing as for the standards prevailing in the interwar period. Adler acts as a defender of children. He attaches great importance to this development period. In his works, the postulate of respect for childhood as a separate period in the life of a person is clear, which cannot be measured by adult standards. “Putting ourselves in a child’s shoes, we must always look further and imagine where the power at which we look may one day lead a child” (Adler, no year of publication, p. 25). On the other hand, at the same time, the concept of Janusz Korczak (1992) is being developed in Poland, which to a much greater extent develops the concept of respect for the child. However, it is difficult to say whether Adler even knew the views of Janusz Korczak, and therefore it is not possible to speak of a charge resulting from the disregard of his thoughts. Adler also emphasizes the harm caused to the child and then ill-treated adult in the family. He emphasizes the child’s delicacy and the need to properly lead him up to adulthood. Adler draws attention to the environment in which the child is brought up, and emphasizes its importance for his further development. This is all a novelty in psychology. Views on education are always related to the cultural period in which they arise. In this sense, Adler’s thought is innovative, because it arises in the period in which discipline and frigidity prevail. Nowadays, we can see a period of devoting a lot of attention to the child, so views about the importance of the environment in upbringing as well as the approach to pampering children are different. It seems difficult to judge Adler and his influence on the present day. At the same time, he should be recognized as a precursor in thinking about family failures in raising a child and the possibility of their modern correction as part of school education, which is still an element of reflection in pedagogy (e.g. Aszkielowicz, 2018; Batiuk, 2016 and others).

In contrast, Adler’s views on school education and the role of teacher in raising a child seem to be important for contemporary pedagogy. First of all, when reading Adler’s views (1946) in this context, one gets the impression that he treats the school primarily as a place of upbringing of the child, towards which the didactic function is secondary. In addition, what will be difficult to maintain today and not necessarily positive, is the fact that he sees family education through the prism of possible mistakes, and therefore, in the matters of education, he sees the primacy of the school – as a professional parenting institution – over the family. The task of the school, as mentioned above, is primarily to observe the child, also in terms of errors committed in the upbringing by the family environment and their correction. At the same

time, reading Adler (1946), I get the impression that he commits the same error that occurs in contemporary pedagogical theories, i.e. his lecture – although directed to teachers – is theoretical. Adler tells the teachers in it, what mistakes they can observe in the behavior of children, but does not provide practical advice on how to proceed to correct them.

CONCLUSION

In Adler there are many innovative elements that have become permanent achievements of psychology, for example, the statement that the character develops in every human being under the influence of culture and social conditions in which a given unit functions and is not hereditary (Adler, no year of publication, p. 23) – as previously stated. Other topics, such as the realization of the unknown purpose of the entire community or the binding of human spirituality to physiology and psyche (Adler, no year of publication, pp. 17-18), could not be continued due to the inability to justify them. For the author's justification, we can assume that he was aware of the lack of methodological grounds, and therefore a kind of "pioneering" of his research. He writes: "There is no method in this direction; it remains at the same time stage as chemistry, when it was still alchemy" (Adler, no year of publication, p. 15). Looking also at the issues considered from the perspective of the present, the author of the article does not deprive Frankl of the key place. After all, it was he who distinguished the third dimension, apart from the dimensions of humanity (biological and psychological) characteristic of Freud and Adler, which is spirituality, responsible for looking for the meaning of life by man, his individuality, freedom and responsibility (Frankl, 1984, 2010, 2012a, 2017). This also changes the view of upbringing, because from that time we treat the man as a full individual capable of realizing the meaning of life only for him, because he depends not only on specific personal characteristics, but also on specific possibilities, human potential, as well as realizing in specific life situations. However, the question should be asked: would Frankl go so far in his deliberations if – apart from other elements* – he did not know first of all the views of Freud, but first of all Adler? It seems that it could be put into question.

* These include: the thorough philosophical preparation of Frankl mentioned in the opening part of this article (see note 4), his first works created before World War II and military experience – he was a prisoner of the camps at Auschwitz and Dachau, and the impact of these experiences on his concept of the meaning of life has been described, among others at work *Man's search for meaning* (Frankl, 2012b).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, A. (1946). *Psychologia indywidualna w wychowaniu*. Kraków.
- Adler, A. (1986). *Sens życia*. Warszawa.
- Adler, A. (2016). *Wiedza o życiu*. Kraków.
- Adler, A. (no year of publication). *Znajomość człowieka. Charakter*. Warszawa – Poznań – Kraków – Lwów.
- Aries, P. (2001). *Historia dzieciństwa*. Warszawa.
- Aszkielewicz, A. (2018). Błędy wychowawcze popełniane przez rodziców i ich rola w kształtowaniu rozwoju dziecka. *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Humanitas. Pedagogika*, 16.
- Batiuk, A. (2016). Rodzina a architektura współczesnego świata. *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Humanitas. Pedagogika*, 13.
- Borowska, T. (2003). *Pedagogia ograniczeń ludzkiej egzystencji*. Warszawa.
- Dobroczyński, B. (2009). *Kłopoty z duchowością. Szkice z pogranicza psychologii*. Kraków.
- Frankl, V.E. (1984). *Homo patiens. Logoterapia i jej kliniczne zastosowanie. Pluralizm nauk a jedność człowieka. Człowiek wolny*. Warszawa.
- Frankl, V.E. (2010). *Wola sensu. Założenia i zastosowanie logoterapii*. Warszawa.
- Frankl, V.E. (2012a). *Bóg ukryty. W poszukiwaniu ostatecznego sensu*. Warszawa.
- Frankl, V.E. (2012b). *Człowiek w poszukiwaniu sensu*. Warszawa.
- Frankl, V.E. (2017). *Lekarz i dusza. Wprowadzenie do logoterapii i analizy egzystencjalnej*. Warszawa.
- Karkowska, M. (2009). *Socjologia wychowania. Wybrane elementy. Mechanizmy socjalizacji i edukacja szkolna*. Łódź.
- Korczak, J. (1992). *Jak kochać dziecko?*. Warszawa.
- Mariański, J. (1990). *W poszukiwaniu sensu życia. Szkice teologiczno-pastoralne*. Lublin.
- Markinówna, E. (1935). *Psychologia indywidualna Adlera i jej znaczenie pedagogiczne*. Warszawa.
- Mazanka, P. (2000). Sekularyzm a sens życia. Uwagi wstępne. In P. Mazanka (ed.), *Filozoficzne orientacje w wyborze sensu życia*. Warszawa.
- Michalski, J. (2011). *Sens życia a pedagogika. Impulsy myśli Viktora E. Frankla*. Toruń.
- Orzelska, J. (2014). *W stronę pedagogiki istotnej egzystencjalnie. Życie i jego trudności z energią duchową jako wyzwanie pedagogiczne rezyduów tożsamości*. Kraków.
- Rondthaler, A. (1930). *Psychologia indywidualna Alfreda Adlera jako metoda pracy wychowawczej w szkole*. Warszawa.

Spętana J. (2018). *Wychowanie a sens życia. Człowiek w obliczu dylematów egzystencjalnych*. Kraków.

Spętana, J. (2015). Sens życia jako problem badawczy we współczesnej pedagogice. In J. Spętana, D. Domagała, V. Drabik-Podgórna (eds.), *Filozoficzne implikacje w pedagogice. O sensie życia, edukacji i wychowaniu*. Kraków.

Teodorczuk, P. (2015). Inspiracje filozoficzne teorii Viktora E. Frankla. *Filo-Sofija*, 31.

Wolicki, M. (2007). *Logoterapeutyczna koncepcja wychowania*. Stalowa Wola – Sandomierz.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE ALFRED ADLER CONCEPT FOR THE ANALYSIS OF THE MEANING OF LIFE IN CONTEMPORARY PEDAGOGY

Keywords: meaning of life, Alfred Adler, upbringing

Abstract: Contemporary thinking about the meaning of life seems impossible, or erroneous, without reference to the concept of V.E. Frankl. Despite the fact that it was created just after the Second World War, it remains up to date. However, the first concept of the meaning of life was of Alfred Adler individual psychology concept. Although many of its elements are no longer valid today, I think its contemporary analysis is important for two reasons: 1. The misinterpretation of Adler's view by V.E. Frankl; 2. The pedagogical theme developed in Adler's concept (the importance of education and upbringing institutions for shaping the meaning of human life), and their lack in the concept of V.E. Frankl. Thus, the first part of the article briefly discusses the analysis of Freud's views, without which it seems impossible to understand Adler's thought, then briefly summarizes the basic elements of Adler's concept of the meaning of life, so that the next part of the article will dedicate the conclusions from this concept to contemporary pedagogy.

WNIOSKI Z KONCEPCJI ALFREDA ADLERA DLA ANALIZ SENSU ŻYCIA WE WSPÓŁCZESNEJ PEDAGOGICE

Słowa kluczowe: sens życia, Alfred Adler, wychowanie człowieka

Streszczenie: Współczesne podejmowanie rozważań nad sensem życia wydaje się niemożliwe, a co najmniej błędne, bez odniesienia do koncepcji V.E. Frankla, która mimo że powstała tuż po II Wojnie Światowej, do dziś nie traci swojej aktualności. Jednak tuż przed nią powstała pierwsza na gruncie psychologii koncepcja sensu życia, której autorem był Alfred Adler. Choć wiele jej elementów nie jest już dzisiaj aktualnych, autorka tekstu uznała za celowe podjęcie tego tematu z dwóch powodów: 1. Nietrafnej jej zdaniem krytyki poglądów Adlera przez V.E. Frankla; 2. Rozbudowanego w koncepcji Adlera wątku pedagogicznego (znaczenia wychowania i instytucji wychowujących dla kształtowania sensu życia człowieka), którego to elementu brakuje w koncepcji Frankla. Stąd w pierwszej części artykułu została pokrótce omówiona analiza poglądów Freuda, bez której niemożliwe wydaje się zrozumienie myśli Adlera, następnie przedstawiono podstawowe elementy Adlerowskiej koncepcji sensu życia, tak by kolejną część artykułu poświęcić wyciągnięciu wniosków z tej koncepcji dla współczesnej pedagogiki.