

possibilities of dialogue. In the third part the author deals with the (modern) theories of learning which are important for our understanding of the nature and meaning of non-formal learning and of the meaning of collaboration, community, praxis and dialogue for learning. In this frame he presents three theories of learning – the social, the situational and the »terrain« ones – as supporting the last claim. The central subject of the fourth part is dialogic inquiry. The whole essay is pervaded by a strong conviction of the author about the exceptional meaning of the constructivist approach to learning and in learning, especially of the approach established by Vygotsky. The main constituents of the frame of reference of the essay are represented by the work of Vygotsky and other constructivists (Piaget, Freire). Among the present researchers the names Doris Ash and Gordon Wells (dialogic inquiry), Mark K. Smith and Daniel Schugurensky (situational learning) should be mentioned in particular. The conceptual analysis in the first part can largely be attributed to D. W. Livingston. The *fil rouge* of the essay is an explanation and a justification of the theses about the great importance of non-formal learning and of the meaning of dialogue for learning. The main original contribution of the essay is establishing the advantages of non-formal learning (compared to the formal one) in terms of the possibility and stimulation of dialogue.

Key words: learning, constructivist model of learning, education, non-formal learning, situational learning, dialogue, dialogic inquiry.

Prvi namen avtorja tega članka je bil napisati sicer znanstveno, a obenem vendarle kolikor se da jasno, umljivo, tekoče in berljivo besedilo. Upam, da mi je to vsaj do neke mere uspelo. Najtršo oviro do tega cilja predstavlja prvi razdelek, to pa že zaradi svoje narave, saj gre za pojmovno analizo, ki je po svoji naravi, če je dobra, vsaj do neke mere tudi dlakocepska, take stvari pa se težko tekoče berejo. Po eni strani lahko bralec ta prvi razdelek tudi preskoči. Vendar pa se mi po drugi strani zdi, še posebno, ker sem poklicni filozof, da ga iz razprave ne morem izpustiti. Namen dobre filozofije je opozarjanje na pojmovne distinkcije, brez poznavanja katerih je naše mišljenje inferiornejše in za marsikaj slepo.

Poleg temeljne filozofske metode pojmovne analize, ki jo gojim v članku, velja omeniti usmerjenost, ki jo pravzaprav narekuje moje osnovno zadržanje solidarnega personalizma¹, ki je v temeljnem nasprotju z instrumentalizmom. To zadržanje, ki prežema vse moje razmišljanje in je njegova temeljna podlaga, *background*, mojo pozornost v prvi vrsti usmerja na dejavnike učlovečenja človeka, če uporabim govorico klasi-

1 Za podrobnejšo pojasnitev (solidarnega) personalizma in instrumentalizma cf. Žalec, B., 2010a.