**Joanna Kiereś-Łach**

# The Philosophical Foundations of Communication Education

## Preliminary remarks

Public speaking, rhetoric, persuasive techniques or the art of discussion and debate, as well as interpersonal, verbal, non-verbal and intercultural communication, are topics that have entered the contemporary scientific discourse a long time ago. Already in the first issues of scientific journals in the field of communication, such as the Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking, published for the first time in 1915 (now the Quarterly Journal of Speech), the issues concerning, inter alia, what are the characteristics of good public speaking, what is and what a discussion should look like and what communication education should look like at different levels of education, were discussed. It seems, however, that research directions are still limited to a practical approach to communication. It is primarily about developing and strengthening the broadly understood individual communication com-

Joanna Kiereś-Łach, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
joanna.kieres-lach@kul.pl • ORCID: 0000-0002-4716-8674

petences enabling life in society and achieving one's own development goals.[1]

The development of technology and the mediatization of society today have a huge impact on all spheres of human life. Therefore, educational institutions face the important task of not only tracking changes in the communication space, but also ensuring and maintaining a high standard of education, thanks to which people will be equipped with appropriate interpersonal competences from the early years of their education. Communication education issues are taken up in the framework of various disciplines: journalism, public relations, advertising. However, they are rarely undertaken in a philosophical context.

Communication education is a general term that includes the skills of speaking and listening, as well as learning and teaching others. Researchers have long wondered about the competences that a teacher should have to support student development, about teaching strategies that support the learning process, about methods that will teach not only to speak in public, but above all to communicate with others in an effective and appropriate manner, and to evaluate messages (both in the interpersonal space and in the media).[2]

It can be said that communication education focuses on, on the one hand, how to teach communication, and on the other hand, how to communicate with a student in order to effectively convey knowledge to him or her. Two terms differentiating these aspects can be found in the literature: the rhetorical approach and the relational approach.[3]

---

[1] James C. McCroskey and Joseph L. McCroskey, "Instructional communication: The historical perspective," in *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives*, ed. Timothy P. Mottet, Virginia P. Richmond, James C. McCroskey (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2006), 33–47.

[2] Ann Q. Staton-Spicer and Donald H. Wulff, "Research in communication and instruction: Categorization and synthesis," *Communication Education*, no. 33 (1984): 377–391.

[3] James C. McCroskey and Kristin M. Valencic and Virginia P. Richmond, "Toward a general model of instructional communication," *Communication Quarterly*, no. 52

The rhetorical approach emphasizes the role of teachers as those who have a key influence on the learning process, because they, through various persuasive techniques, make decisions about the choice of the topic and the way of presenting it, and shape the student's approach to education. It is emphasized that the teacher is responsible for the teaching process, therefore he or she should develop a style of communication that will implement the ancient tasks of the speaker (Latin *officia oratoris*), i.e. inventio (appropriate selection of content), *dispositio* (proper ordering of selected content), elocutio (the way of presenting this content in the language), *memoria* (remembering the content planned to be communicated) and *actio* (appropriate delivery of content, including verbal and non-verbal communication). Teachers who speak clearly and in a structured manner are more likely to convey learning content that is interesting and understandable. Attention to explaining difficult concepts, formulating appropriate examples, and clearly conveying the content not only facilitates understanding and remembering, but also increases students' motivation to learn and bring satisfaction from expanding the scope of their knowledge.[4]

In the relational approach, however, attention is paid mainly to the way the teacher communicates with the student at the interpersonal level. Does he or she interact with the student, allow him or her to discuss, show concern and understanding, and adjust the message to the individual needs of his or her audience? As part of this approach, researchers focus on personality traits that favor teaching and those that act as a barrier to adequate communication. Teachers who are assertive and responsive to student behavior are perceived as more

---

(2004): 197-210; James C. McCroskey and Joseph L. McCroskey, *Instructional communication: The historical perspective*, 33–47.

[4] James C. McCroskey and Joseph L. McCroskey, *Instructional communication: The historical perspective*, 33–47.

effective, credible and competent, while those who are responsive and show concern for students' well-being and understanding of the content they convey are perceived to be supportive, trustworthy, and can be counted on to help when needed.[5]

The interpersonal competence of the sender of the message, as well as the way he or she does it, are extremely important issues. However, it should also be remembered that if a person who wants to convey something to others does not adhere to the truth about reality, does not use rational language, but tries at all costs to draw the recipient's attention to himself or herself with the words he or she utters, then he or she not only becomes incomprehensible to others, but what's more, builds a model of communication based on stimulating others to construct their own, subjective image of the world, in which they can freely change the meanings of the words spoken – depending on their preferences, context or, finally, the goal they want to achieve.[6]

## Communication in education

The approach which is not about presenting the truth in communication, but about a game of appearances, was already presented by ancient teachers – the sophists. The words of Phaedros are eloquent, who – in his discussion with Socrates – states that whoever wants to be a speaker does not have to know what is fair, but what the crowd thinks is the truth. So truth, goodness and beauty are irrelevant. The most important thing is what convinces people.[7] It seems to still be valid

---

[5] James C. McCroskey and Joseph L. McCroskey, *Instructional communication: The historical perspective*, 33–47.

[6] José M. Barrio Maestre, "Crítica filosófica al constructivismo," in *Actas del Congreso Internacional: ¿Una sociedad despersonalizada? Propuestas educativas*, ed. Enrique Martínez (Barcelona: Editorial Balmes, 2012): 25–40.

today. Words are no longer an expression of "the reality of things," but have become information characterized by the fact that it is apparent and transient. The world of beings that we get to know is no longer the world of truth that we read from reality, but the world of information transmitted, which, depending on the sender and intentions with which they communicate, take on various meanings.[8]

If, on the other hand, the word that reflects the truth about being is a sign of the order of reality, then the word that only appears to be truth, and is also fleeting, becomes a sign of chance, disorder, chaos. The intellect, on the other hand, which reads the truth written in being, ceases to be the author of this word. Its author becomes the will, which imposes meaning on it in an arbitrary manner, depending on the context and intentions.[9]

Meanwhile, the author of the message should make every effort to convey it, to say—as far as possible—the truth about what he or she is talking about. Quintilian wrote about it when he defined the purpose of rhetoric:

> Writers on rhetoric have fallen into some false, in my opinion, ambition not to define anything with the same words that someone else had already used before them. Of course, I am not applying for such originality and I will say not necessarily what I come up with, but what I consider to be good, namely that rhetoric is knowledge in terms of reliable pronunciation. For, since its best term has been invented once, anyone who seeks another must therefore seek a worse one. In accepting this, we also obtain a clear definition of the goal or ultimate ideal of rhetoric,

---

[7] "καὶ πάντως λέγοντα τὸ δὴ εἰκὸς διωκτέον εἶναι, πολλὰ εἰπόντα χαίρειν τῷ ἀληθεῖ", Platón, "Fedro" 272e, in Platon, *Diálogos*, vol. III, (Madrid: Gredos, 1986).

[8] Enrique Martínez, "Verba Doctoris: La fecundidad educativa de las palabras del maestro," in *Sapientia*, no. LXXI (237): 40–44.

[9] *Ibid*.

which in Greek is called *télos*, to which all this art is heading; for if it itself is knowledge of honest pronunciation, its goal and ideal is to practice honest pronunciation.[10]

The reality that is available in our cognition is not self-understood. It is composed of entities that combine into cause-and-effect relationships. Often, in order to understand a phenomenon, one must reach for its cause, and then for the cause of that cause. Only then does it reveal itself to us in its entirety. The person who has achieved this understanding has the difficult task of imparting knowledge to others in such a way that, first, they do not become discouraged from further seeking the truth, and that they begin this difficult process at the right starting point. The teacher is therefore someone needed, because thanks to the education he or she has received, he or she has much more advanced knowledge, understanding the world and tools enabling proper and purposeful communication. However, if his or her words, means and educational methods are incomprehensible to the student, then it will discourage him or her from learning the truth and direct him/her to take a shortcut. In other words, if the language with which we speak about the world is not understandable to the recipient, then the world described by this language will be not understandable either. Clear, precise, and sound messages and an indication that the teacher (in the broadest sense) is someone necessary to know and understand the world are criteria without which the educational process becomes meaningless. Education is talking about difficult things as simply as possible. Developing the belief in a student that he or she will not achieve knowledge alone, without the help of teachers, is a key element of his or her further development. The medieval philosopher and

---

[10] Marek Fabiusz Kwintylian, *Kształcenie mówcy* [Institutes of Oratory], vol. II, chapter XV (Cracow: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2012).

theologian Bernard of Chartres uttered the following words, which indicate how important it is to use the knowledge and understanding of those who sought the truth before us:

> We are like dwarfs that climb on the shoulders of giants to see more than them and see further, not because of our sharp eyesight or body height, but because we climb up and rise to the height of giants.[11]

These words, treated in the cultural discourse as the so-called winged thoughts (Greek: ἔπεα πτερόεντα, epea pteroenta), i.e., commonly known and often quoted statements, due to their pictorial, colorful and allusive nature, have become the subject of interpretation of many thinkers, including Umberto Eco. He stated that based on the great achievements of our ancestors and adding even a small brick to what they discovered, we in some way outgrow them, but our discoveries are the result of a joint effort.[12]

If, however, what our predecessors discovered was not confirmed in reality, and was only their subjective interpretation conditioned by some individual goal, then we would start our cognition of the world from scratch each time, and science would not be at the point where it is today. Moreover, in order for the exchange of experiences and the effects of cognition to be possible, rules of communication are needed that will regulate the discourse and guard its goal.

---

[11] Stefan Swieżawski, *Dzieje europejskiej filozofii klasycznej* [The history of classical European philosophy] (Warszawa–Wrocław: PWN, 2000): 487.

[12] Umberto Eco, *Na ramionach olbrzymów. Wykłady na festiwalu La Milesiana w latach 2001–2015* [On the shoulders of giants. Lectures at the festival La Milesiana in the years 2011–2015], trans. Krzysztof Żaboklicki (Warsaw: Noir Sur Blanc, 2019).

## Communication education—rules of discourse

Discourse, understood as an element of communication consisting in the exchange of thoughts and views, is inextricably linked with the emergence of philosophy. In their reflections on the world and man, the ancient Greeks began a centuries-old dialogue. It has always been conducted according to certain rules, without which it is impossible to exchange thoughts.

The first rule says that the existence of truth (as the conformity of intellect with thing) should be considered as the criterion for formulating views. This means that reality is the test of our views and statements. The point in the sentences uttered by the participants is whether they are true, not whether somebody likes them, whether they make an impression, or whether they are a manifestation of speaker's experiences.[13]

The second rule indicates that one should adopt intersubjective ways of achieving this truth, i.e., some ways of knowing it and the possibility of communicating it to others. In the event of any discussion, its participants should take care of the correctness of the arguments they formulate. It is taught by rhetoric and logic. Two conditions for the correctness of arguments are indicated: the law of non-contradiction and the law of the excluded middle. The first is that of two contradictory statements, at most one is true, and in the case of reality it means that nothing can happen and not happen at the same time. The second one says that if we have two contradictory statements, one of them must be true and the other false.

The third rule emphasizes that the freedom and rationality of discourse participants should be respected. So, we persuade others with

---

[13] Henryk Kiereś, *Człowiek i cywilizacja* [Man and civilization] (Lublin: *Servire Veritati* IEN, 2007): 101–102.

integrity without resorting to manipulation, lies, intimidation or other forms of pressure.[14]

The above rules can be organized by relating them to branches of philosophy. The existence of truth means that there is a reality that tests our beliefs about the world (these are metaphysical issues). Searching for truth means that there are some methods, that is, ways of arriving at knowledge (these are epistemological issues). Respecting freedom and rationality takes into account the anthropological and ethical aspects of discourse (these are issues from the philosophy of morality). The rules of discourse do not only concern philosophical issues, but also cover all spheres of human life. This means that even in conversations with friends or in the family, we can either respect the given rules and conduct an honest and cognitively valuable exchange of thoughts, i.e., an exchange of thoughts that brings us closer to the truth, or we can go in the direction of manipulation or pointless arguments.[15]

It is worth adding that in order for the discourse to be fruitful at all, it must be about something. And it is not about choosing a topic that is controversial or currently popular. The point is to clearly formulate the question, that is, to pose the problem. If we ask a question and oblige the participants to stick to the topic, we will certainly not waste time, and the discussion will not be about everything and about nothing, it will not be an exchange of impressions, i.e., what it seems to whom, but a joint attempt to discover the truth.

We can discuss theoretical issues. Then we try to find out how it really is. An example are discussions of a philosophical nature, such as the discussion of early philosophers about whether *arché* is water or air. It was theoretical in nature, because its participants tried to establish something about it. We can also discuss practical issues. Then we

---

[14] Henryk Kiereś, *Człowiek i cywilizacja* [Man and civilization], 101–102.

[15] Henryk Kiereś, „Kultura klasyczna wobec postmodernizmu" [Classical culture towards postmodernism], *Człowiek w Kulturze*, no. 11 (1998): 242.

try to determine how it should be. In this case, we are discussing with the intention of convincing someone to introduce some changes or determine how to do something (what actions to take). Ancient philosophers, for example, who dealt with the issues of attaining happiness, argued that there were different ways of acting that would lead us to that happiness.

Let us add that the ability to use basic concepts is important in discourse and argumentation. One should distinguish the thesis from the argument. A thesis is a statement that someone accepts as true and tries to convince somebody of it (if he or she is not convinced of the truth of the thesis, but still persists stubbornly, it means that he or she is trying to manipulate or simply self-love (pride) does not allow him or her to admit his or her mistake). The argument is formulated to justify the thesis. In other words, this is the reason why we are to accept this thesis.

Knowledge of the above rules is crucial and should become an element of education. Contemporary social discourse that takes place in social media, especially in the so-called virtual reality, gives everyone the opportunity to speak on any issue, regardless of their competences and culture of language. Therefore, there is an increase in the so-called communication chaos and there is a common lack of communication skills, as manifested especially in the ignorance of or even an ostentatious disregard of the criteria of discourse. It points to such phenomena as the brutalization or vulgarization of language and an evident lack of understanding of the issues at hand, what is said and how it is said. They make the social debate, in its content (semantic), largely reduced to a cognitively sterile exchange of opinions. What is worse, although these opinions express various attitudes and views of a worldview nature, and thus are to a large extent subjective, due to the lack of the aforementioned universal criteria of discourse, they are regarded as cognitively equal. On the other hand, it is often enough to use professional terminology and build a syntactic statement in order to pretend to be an expert in a given matter. In other words, superficial linguistic

competence and proficiency, expressing merely someone else's opinion, may be regarded as binding for users of media and internet forums. Moreover, due to the possibility of anonymous participation in the discourse—which is made possible by social forums—the responsibility for the spoken (written) word disappears. That is why education in this area is so important.

Moreover, it is commonly believed that the purpose of the discussion is simply to win it. Entering the discussion from the very beginning assumes that someone has to be defeated and someone has to win. That is why many people think that sometimes no holds are barred. Such an approach at the starting point assumes a negative attitude towards another person or treating him or her as a material for preparation or confrontation. In this approach, manipulation is used – the words uttered by the speaker are negative, and the procedures he or she uses are aimed at shaping someone's attitude, behavior or belief by means that are dishonest, secret and inconsistent with the good. This dishonesty may include, for example, lying outright or concealing the goals pursued by the manipulative person. People with this attitude do not care about anyone's interests. Their goal is to win the dispute at any cost, not to come closer to the truth. An honest discussion, however, is not about winning, but about finding a common reason for accepting or rejecting a position or action for the sake of the recognized good. In order to see and understand this, it is important to bear in mind that the goal of communication is not self-gain, but the intersubjective truth that is associated with an intersubjective good.

## Rhetoric and its philosophical foundations

The essence of human activity in the field of culture is the rational and purposeful cultivation of the world, and one of the important areas of this cultivation, especially in its social dimension, is the language

through which man can express his states and communicate with others. Language is the subject of interest and research in many sciences and disciplines, among which rhetoric, i.e., the art of speaking beautifully, stands out. It was discovered in ancient Greece as an expression of the rationality of a man (*zoon logikon*), gifted with speech (*echon logon*), using speech in social discourse, especially political and judicial. The achievements of the Greeks in the field of language culture were appreciated by the Romans, and in the Middle Ages, when rhetorical education became a permanent part of the canon of humanistic education as an element of the so-called liberal arts (*artes liberales*). Rhetoric – along with logic and grammar – was to provide tools to discipline thinking and communication. The prestige of rhetoric was lowered in the Renaissance. It became only the art of using a decorative and lexically rich language efficiently. This rhetoric focused on the problem of tropes, word figures and the technique of verbal expression. As a consequence, it was transformed into a discipline that is nowadays referred to as stylistics.[16]

Rhetoric, understood primarily as the art of expressing subjective opinions and individual emotions, began to be treated as elaborate hollow words, with the help of which the speaker – "an eloquent man" (*homo loquens*) – hides his own ignorance and lack of competence. The second tendency in the approach to rhetoric has placed this discipline on the side of manipulation and made it a set of manipulative techniques that deceive other people and thus pose a threat to their rationality and freedom.[17]

---

[16] Chaim Perelman, "The New Rhetoric: A Theory of Practical Reasoning," in *The New Rhetoric and the Humanities* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1979): 1–2.

[17] Jakub Z. Lichański, *Retoryka od renesansu do współczesności – tradycja i innowacja* [Rhetoric from the Renaissance to modernity – tradition and innovation], (Warsaw: DiG, 2000).

The history of how rhetoric is treated is closely related to philosophy, which – as we know from textbooks and compendiums on philosophy – is not a monolith of thought. Philosophy is made up of two traditions: the tradition of realism and the tradition of idealism, which, in turn, are internally conflicting and consist of two currents: irrationalism and rationalism. Both traditions are characterized by a specific attitude towards the problem of rhetoric, its presence in culture and its concept. Undoubtedly, there are three sources of thought that have influenced and still influence the way of presenting and solving the above-mentioned issues, namely the sophists and Plato, and the thought of Aristotle and the Stoics. An insight into these three sources of rhetoric proves that it is based on a specific concept of the world and man and the purpose of his or her existence in the world. It follows that the debate over the problem of rhetoric, or more broadly: communication, is philosophically conditioned and that in order to understand its purpose well, the problem of philosophy itself must be resolved in terms of its mental claims to explain the mystery of the world and man.[18]

It can be assumed that the criterion for assessing various concepts of rhetoric that emerge from these three sources is the ancient principle of "right reason" (*orthos logos*; *recta ratio*), i.e., the need to respect the anthropological factor in the light of which the general principles of cultural discourse are defined. The sender of the message should always have the benefit of the recipient of the message in mind, and its addressee should have the ability to adopt the right attitude towards the message in question. He or she should understand the cause-and-effect relationships contained therein, should distinguish between facts and

---

[18] Piotr Jaroszyński and Lindael Rolstone, "Sophists, Aristotle and Stoics: three concepts of ancient rhetoric," *Studia Gilsoniana* 11, no. 1 (January–March 2022): 59–87; Joanna Kiereś-Łach, *Filozofia i retoryka. Kontekst myślowy „nowej retoryki" Chaima Perelmana* [Philosophy and Rhetoric. The idea context of the 'new rhetoric' of Chaim Perelman] (Lublin: Academicon, 2015).

opinions, recognize erroneous assumptions, and analyze the content in terms of their compliance with the subject of communication. It seems that the general model of rhetorical discourse outlined in this way should be the basis of rhetorical education. The combination of these two aspects of the discourse guarantees the ordering of the various methods used in it according to the criteria of the so-called critical thinking.[19]

## Final remarks

When spoken words are not rooted in being, they cease to be a communication tool and become only *flatus vocis*, i.e., a name without an equivalent, a hollow word. The criterion for their evaluation is then not the reference to the truth, but whether they are pleasant and attractive to the recipient. Such words are fleeting, introduce chaos and force communication participants to make the effort of constantly inventing something new—not at all related to the truth about the world.[20]

Contemporary Spanish philosopher and theologian Francisco Canals noted that this lack of rooting of the word in being and striving to create new and attractive words is especially the domain of the media. We often see how much the so-called 'facts' presented in the news services differ from the actual state of affairs. Journalists pay more attention to the fact that their message is interesting and shocking than that it reflects the reality it refers to.[21] All this makes the phe-

---

[19] Paweł Gondek, "Communio and communicatio: the role of communication for participating in public life," *Studia Gilsoniana* 4:1 (2015): 21–22.

[20] Enrique Martínez, *Verba Doctoris: La fecundidad educativa de las palabras del maestro*, 50–51.

[21] Francisco Canals, "Teoría y praxis en la perspectiva de la dignidad del ser personal," *Actas del Congreso Internacional ¿Una sociedad despersonalizada? Propuestas educativas,* ed. Enrique Martínez (Barcelona: Editorial Balmes, 2012): 17.

nomenon of empty words and verbalism more and more common. This was pointed out by Jacques Maritain, who wrote that means that become ends in themselves, and not something that is intended to lead to this end, cease to have any practical value. They then multiply end-lessly and only widen the range, which leads to confusion. It is normal and related to the natural dynamism of reality that new means leading to an end arise. This is a sign of some progress. The point is that they should actually lead to this goal. New words should refer to an undis-covered aspect of reality, they should bring new knowledge and under-standing of the world, and not only expand the scope of vocabulary and meanings, the interpretation of which is arbitrary.[22]

Another very serious consequence that we can observe in the sci-entific language of broadly understood education is the multitude of regulations and laws that do not help and organize, but introduce chaos and cause useless work consisting in multiplying subsequent regula-tions, laws, programs, reports, etc. Teachers devote all their efforts to meeting new ministerial expectations, they make sure that the lan-guage they use in their work contains specific and sophisticated words that do not relate to reality at all, but are only a kind of semantically empty *newspeak* that sounds wise but instead of explaining, confuses and discourages. Inundated with these meaningless words and expres-sions, students become discouraged from learning, limit their expres-sions to simple messages and become convinced that language is a bar-rier to understanding the world, not a means of understanding it.

Contrary to this common phenomenon today, issues in the field of communication and communication education should be grounded in the philosophy of man, especially in the context of various interper-

---

[22] Jean J. Maritain, "Pour une Philosophie de l'Éducation," previously: "L'Éducation à la croisée des chemins," in J. and R. Maritain, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. VIII (Friburg: Éditions Universitaires Paris, Éditions Saint-Paul, 1988): 771–772.

sonal relationships and their conditions. Language is then the tool by which the recipient is engaged by authenticating the sender. This authentication takes the form of communication patterns through which persuasion becomes possible. In other words, authentication is a type of proof that is based on finding what is convincing, using words that are verifiable when we confront them with the actual state of affairs.[23]

Every day we deal with situations in which we convince someone, express an opinion on a subject, or communicate our emotional states. The ability to communicate precisely, relevant to the subject and adapted to the listener, is an element of the broadly understood culture of language. Knowing the rules of discourse, understanding the essence of communication, and seeing its relationship with philosophy (including ethics, anthropology, or the theory of cognition) allows us to protect ourselves from manipulation. It also helps to consciously formulate arguments adequate to the content. Knowing the rules governing discourse increases the probability of the accuracy of our message and the effectiveness of the arguments we formulate.

Education, as a form of support for other people in getting to know the world and in discovering the truth about oneself, should be built on communication in which the objective truth about the world is expressed, in which the word shows being, relates to it and reveals it. This was emphasized by Thomas Aquinas when he pointed out that the teacher, as a person with greater knowledge about the world, must convey this knowledge properly. The words he or she uses should express his or her intellect, which has come closer to knowing the truth about the world. The language describing a given fragment of reality should

[23] Joanna M. Gondek, "Ethos jako forma perswazji retorycznej w ujęciu Arystotelesa," [Ethos as a form of rhetorical persuasion in Aristotle's perspective] *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія: теорія культури і філософія науки*, Випуск 49–1 (2013): 114–120.

even bring a person closer to understanding it than the reality itself. A word, like a thing, is supposed to lead to knowledge, not to introduce chaos and consternation.[24]

———— ❧ ————

## Philosophical foundations of communication education
### SUMMARY

This article deals with the philosophical foundations of communication education. At the beginning, the author points out that communication skills are an important issue. For a long time, researchers have been wondering about the good qualities of public speaking, as well as what qualities a speaker should have in order to convey knowledge, and the importance of communication skills in social life and individual development. Then the author shows what communication education is understood as, on the one hand, the ability to transfer knowledge, and on the other hand, teaching to communicate clearly and purposefully. In the next step, the author indicates the differences between the rhetorical approach and the relational approach to communication, and then points to the rules of discourse and emphasizes the importance of a realistic philosophy focused on presenting the truth in accordance with the good of the recipient. Finally, she indicates the consequences of the approach to communication detached from the real and intersubjective reality and shows what responsibility therefore lies on the part of the teacher, as the one who is supposed to bring students closer to the truth.

———————————

[24] Enrique Martínez, *Verba Doctoris: La fecundidad educativa de las palabras del maestro*, 44–46.

**Keywords:** communication education, philosophy, rhetoric, teacher, teaching, critical thinking, truth, rules of discourse

REFERENCES

Barrio Maestre, José M. „Crítica filosófica al constructivismo," *Actas del Congreso Internacional ¿Una sociedad despersonalizada? Propuestas educativas*, ed. Enrique Martínez. Barcelona: Editorial Balmes, 2012.

Francisco Canals, "Teoría y praxis en la perspectiva de la dignidad del ser personal," *Actas del Congreso Internacional ¿Una sociedad despersonalizada? Propuestas educativas*, ed. Enrique Martínez. Barcelona: Editorial Balmes, 2012.

Eco, Umberto. *Na ramionach olbrzymów. Wykłady na festiwalu La Milesiana w latach 2001–2015* [On the shoulders of giants. Lectures at the festival La Milesiana in the years 2011–2015]. Trans. K. Żaboklicki. Warsaw: Noir Sur Blanc, 2019.

Gondek, Joanna M., "Ethos jako forma perswazji retorycznej w ujęciu Arystotelesa" [Ethos as a form of rhetorical persuasion in Aristotle's perspective], *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія: теорія культури і філософія науки, Випуск* 49–1 (2013).

Gondek, Paweł. "Communio and communicatio: the role of communication for participating in public life". *Studia Gilsoniana* 4:1 (January–March 2015).

Jaroszyński, Piotr, and Lindael Rolstone. "Sophists, Aristotle and Stoics: three concepts of ancient rhetoric". *Studia Gilsoniana* 11. No. 1 (January–March 2022).

Kiereś-Łach, Joanna. *Filozofia i retoryka. Kontekst myślowy „nowej retoryki" Chaima Perelmana* [Philosophy and Rhetoric. The idea context of the 'new rhetoric' of Chaim Perelman]. Lublin: Academicon, 2015.

Kiereś, Henryk. *Człowiek i cywilizacja* [Man and civilization]. Lublin: *Servire Veritati* IEN, 2007.

Kiereś, Henryk. "Kultura klasyczna wobec postmodernizmu" [Classical culture towards postmodernism]. *Człowiek w Kulturze*. Vol. 11, 1998.

Kwintylian, Marek Fabiusz. *Kształcenie mówcy* [Institutes of Oratory]. Trans. Stanisław Śnieżewski. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2012.

Lichański, Jakub Z. *Retoryka od renesansu do współczesności – tradycja i innowacja* [Rhetoric from the Renaissance to modernity – tradition and innovation]. Warszawa: DiG, 2000.

Maritain, Jean J., *Pour une Philosophie de l'Éducation, previously: L'Éducation à la croisée des chemins*. In: J. and R.Maritain, *Oeuvres complètes*. Vol. VIII. Friburg: Éditions Universitaires Paris, Éditions Saint-Paul, 1988.

Martínez, Enrique. "Verba Doctoris: La fecundidad educativa de las palabras del maestro". *Sapientia*. Vol. LXXI (237). Buenos Aires: Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina, Santa María de los Buenos Aires, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, 2015.

McCroskey, James C., and Joseph L. McCroskey. "Instructional communication: The historical perspective". In: T. P. Mottet, V. P. Richmond, J. C. McCroskey (eds.). *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2006.

McCroskey, James C., and Kristin M. Valencic, Virginia P. Richmond, "Toward a general model of instructional communication." *Communication Quarterly* 52. Philadelphia: Taylor&Francis, 2004.

Perelman, Chaim. *The New Rhetoric and the Humanities*. Dodrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1979.

Platon. *Diálogos*. Vol. III. Madrid: Gredos 1986.

*Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* [Universal encyclopedia of philosophy]. Vol. 6. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2006.

Staton-Spicer, Ann Q., and Donald H. Wulff. "Research in communication and instruction: Categorization and synthesis." *Communication Education* 33. Routledge: Taylor&Francis, 1984.

Swieżawski, Stefan. *Dzieje europejskiej filozofii klasycznej* [The history of classical European philosophy]. Warsaw–Wrocław: PWN, 2000.