

WORLDVIEW AND VALUE POTENTIAL OF MAN'S SOCIALITY AS A FACTOR OF CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL SPACE HARMONIZATION

Lyudmyla Afanasyeva

Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky State Pedagogical University

Annotations:

Афанасьєва Людмила. Світоглядно-ціннісний потенціал соціальності людини як чинник гармонізації культурно-освітнього простору

Розкрито світоглядно-методологічні засади освітніх парадигм, їх значення й особливості змін у контексті залучення соціального потенціалу особистості до утворення системи сучасних освітніх цінностей і норм як чинника формування пріоритетів сучасного українського суспільства. Розглянуто теоретико-філософські підходи до осягнення світоглядно-ціннісних чинників раціональності, що є неодмінним атрибутом соціальності, відповідно до принципу комунікативної раціональності. Будучи загальнофілософським принципом, він має значний методологічний резонанс у дослідженнях різних наукових і соціальних практик як умова структурування соціально-філософської рефлексії у світлі вимог постнекласичної раціональності щодо залучення ціннісних і моральнісних чинників до формування евристичного й прогностичного потенціалу сучасної освіти.

Афанасьєва Людмила. Мировоззренческо-ценностный потенциал социальности человека как фактор гармонизации культурно-образовательного пространства

Освещается значение образовательных парадигм и мировоззренческо-методологические основы и особенности их изменения в контексте привлечения социального потенциала личности к формированию системы современных образовательных ценностей и норм как фактора формирования системы ценностей современного украинского общества. Рассматриваются теоретико-философские подходы к постижению мировоззренческо-ценностных факторов рациональности как непрямого атрибута социальности согласно принципу коммуникативной рациональности, как общеполитического принципа, имеющего значительный методологический резонанс в исследованиях различных научных и социальных практик, как обусловленность структурирования социально-философской рефлексии в свете требований постнеклассической рациональности, как основание для привлечения ценностных и нравственных факторов формирования эвристического и прогностического потенциала современного образования.

Afanasyeva Lyudmyla. Worldview and value potential of man's sociality as a factor of cultural and educational space harmonization

The article highlights the meaning of educational paradigms, worldview-methodological grounds and specificity of their changes in the context of attracting the social potential of the personality to the formation of modern educational values and norms as a factor in shaping the value system of modern Ukrainian society. The author studies theoretical and philosophical approaches to understanding worldview and value factors of rationality as an essential attribute of sociality according to the principle of communicative rationality, as a general philosophical principle that has considerable resonance in methodological studies of different scientific and social practices, as a requirement of structuring social and philosophical reflection in the light of postnonclassical rationality demands, as a basis for attracting value and moral factors shaping heuristic and predictive capabilities of modern education.

Key words:

культурно-освітній простір, людновимірність, світоглядно-ціннісний потенціал, соціалізація, філософія освіти.

культурно-образовательное пространство, человекомерность, мировоззренческо-ценностный потенциал, социализация, философия образования.

cultural and educational space, human dimension, world view and value potential, socialization, philosophy of education.

In terms of the creation and consolidation of a global world order where information, science and education set tempo-rhythm and provide sustainability of social welfare relations of a new type of higher education to Ukraine raises the problem of the adequacy of scientific and technical and educational processes which determine its status, trends and rates development, which is the natural consequence of the development of education, given its transition to dimension change in the situation of being and becoming a new kind of man in the modern world. Today education relies task is to make people capable of critical thinking of its existence, the existence of society and humanity as a whole, to help her navigate the technical, technological and socio-cultural aspects of social life.

The realities of modern social situation – both in the world, and in Ukraine – significantly influence the formation of constitutive intentions pedagogical practices, particularly in the use of philosophical plane as a factor in the potential of social rights. Therefore, it is evident that in today's development in Ukraine socio-legal state and civil society

increasingly important ideological, philosophical and axiological understanding of education as one of the most important human values, define its role and place in the value system of sustainable social development, at which transformation processes in our country are oriented. Research of ideological and value potential harmonization of social rights in the cultural and educational space caused by the need to explain the process of formation modern educational system of values and norms in the context of the involvement of the social potential of the individual, not only is one of the key internal organic component of education as a holistic and structured at the same time social institution, but also significantly affect the nature and rate of socio-dynamics value system of modern Ukrainian society.

In our study, we believe that the reform of higher education is a social problem, which was formed in the inter-civilization shift, and hence is a necessity not only modernization and harmonization and methodological foundations of higher education, just need to search for approaches to solve the problems of education in the light of ideological

and methodological, social and philosophical consideration as a complex domestic social and cultural phenomenon in the value system of sustainable development.

In the context defined above objective methodology for training teachers acquire priority and reorientation of education on identity formation strategy for its development and self-development are partially implemented in the humanistic-oriented scientific paradigms and educational system, which is reflected in the development problems of contemporary philosophy of Education (B. Andruschenko, M. Bakhtin, V. Bekh, E. Bondarevskaia, B. Hershunskiy, I. Dobronravova, I. Zyazyun, V. Ilyin, B. Kochanowski, C. Kremen, B. Meadow, W. Lutay, M. Mikhalchenko, I. Nadolny, V. Pazenok, V. Shevchenko, R. Harre), psychological (H. Ball, I. Bekh, V. Bibler, A. Maslow, V. Semichenko), socio-educational (I. Boichenko, V. Voronkov, M. Yevtukh, T. Rozov, G. Filipchuk) anthropological problems (V. Zagorodniuk, M. Kultayeva, A. Loi, V. Makarena, V. Maksakova, O. Ogurtsov, I. Predborska, I. Radionova, H. Roth, I. Stepanenko, V. Tabachkovskiy, N. Khamitov, A. Chernii et al.). Of special attention are the works of such scientists (L. Gorbunov, L. Huberskii, A. Konversky, W. Mason, B. Ogneviuk, M. Romanenko et al.), which highlight the ontological and epistemological aspects of human learning.

The problem of interdependence of education and the paradigm of society as a whole reflects a complex social problems of socio-ontological, existential and epistemological nature that reveal the relationship of philosophy of education with the social environment and through social and cultural sphere defines social determinism value orientations educational activities. It is clear that the main problems of general social trends and determine their appropriate form of goal-setting content and organizational conditions of education, and hence the need to develop and update knowledge of the methodology and the formation of national socio-cultural reality – a need that determines, according to many researchers, priority areas of focus modern social philosophy in general and philosophy of education in particular.

The aim is to make ideological and methodological aspects of socio-philosophical analysis of the nature and axiological potential education as an important social and cultural phenomenon in the structure of priorities for sustainable human development and on this basis to identify the originality and value of educational paradigms, ideological and methodological principles and characteristics of their changes.

Modern realities of educational practice and its philosophical and practical bases are fundamentally different from previous historical stages has that modern social space globally in certain trends

become detrimental to the individual, for humanism, spiritual values, is narrative structure, hyper, space conquest and depersonalization stereotypes in everyday life [4, p. 27–35]. You can say that modern man was not an end but a means (power – formal and informal – institutions) to achieve any goals: political, ideological and economic. In most cases minimization and unification of the human factor in the socialization of modern educational space, blurring humanistic values in modern social structure of education leads to the fact that the individual is not integrated as ontological status, which is why, in fact, a situation of social inclinations of the individual to the influence of the various technologies, etc. [7, p. 440–505].

To a large extent this state of affairs contributed to some delay in the educational sphere efficiency rethinking basic ideological and value component of the learning process in the conditions of globalization challenges: "Watching the results and consequences of their activities (both irrational and rational) and make sense of them, a man was in a situation, inadequate its expectations with which it cannot find common ground, based on the derived in existing education and cultural knowledge and skills"[9, p. 492]. However, we have every reason to argue that the same extent that education as a social institution, which is "the mechanism of action is due to constantly self-replicating social body as a separate country and the social world as a whole" [2], is able to draw ideological and value potential social rights to the harmonization of cultural and educational space in the context of civilization calls for the same extent globalization project BC acts as a universal law of historical and logical ascent of man to himself, to his real and reproducible by man (including in the education) own essence. This discourse is being actively interpreted foreign and domestic science [11, p. 5–12; 23, p. 37-40].

As in other areas of life, such a formation process involves two interrelated task for a human living conditions for all people, without national or social features, and the true development of tribal powers of man, the universalization of its needs, comprehensiveness of personal potential [13; 14]. Already this inherent species differences in the ways the humanistic dimension of contemporary cultural and historical process, where social and educational humanism manifested at the level of consolidation efforts in solving problems through the lens of humanistic tasks of the era of globalization and the socio-economic, and general cultural areas where for all kinds of common humanity is the focus on the individual as the basic humanistic value [1, p. 6–19]. In this context, philosophy (particularly philosophy of science) provides the theoretical and methodological principles of humanistic ascent to dialog mode, although it is clearly indicated by the contradiction of some philosophical schools

and systems are designed, nevertheless, provide humanistic discourse on the stage of science and education, reaching definition expression only under objectively defined coordinate and methodological capabilities achieved [8].

To some extent, the process of globalization and humanizing educational environment are the two objective processes of centrifugal and centripetal character that complement each other, although capable of confrontation. The ultimate goal of humanization – is the humanization of the natural world and society from the standpoint of human needs are increasing. This means that the criterion of social progress and its ultimate goal is the human person, the possibility and the prospect of its full development and its universalization in the scale of culture, society and nature. In that context, global studies and humanities are complementary and interpenetrating parties of any cognitive and educational process [5, p. 116–125]. And in fact, in both cases subject knowledge is man, its external (social and cultural) and internal (individual and personal) side.

Problem of modern educational humanism essentially combines the two vectors analysis of socio-humanitarian knowledge and integrates all the multiplicity and multidimensionality of this analysis, providing the educational humanism truly global perspective. Thus, the process of globalization and humanization is a characteristic feature of modern complex and full of conflicts world. Being realized at public institutions, social groups and individuals, they get their orientation in the cultural and socio-economic development, factors and conditions are different forms of social consciousness. Thus, the internal relationship of globalization and humanization perhaps the most clearly positioned in the methodological paradigm of modern education as one of pressing problems of mankind, which depends on solving social progress and preservation of civilization [10, p. 33–43].

Since the purpose of modern education is the education of citizens, which, above all, able to independently think, theoretical and philosophical approaches to comprehend the ideological and value factors of rationality as an indispensable attribute of sociality, now cannot stay out of the principle of communicative rationality as a general philosophical principle that has significant methodological resonance research in various scientific and social practices, because it is based on directing philosophy perceives education as a realization of a certain type of communicative rationality that it makes extensive use of pedagogical practice for herself education meeting predetermined event "Teacher – Pupil" [6, p. 179].

In fact, the possibility of reflection of interaction and enables even talk about the philosophy of education, as indicated figures seen not simply

as participants of educational process, and as personified figures of society and individuality that will certainly reveal ideological and value potential of sociality [6, p. 179]. Note that since modern times, pedagogical practices were strictly determined by its own scientific rationality, which arose before the task to link facts of reality with certain guidelines and values that justified according academics. Any knowledge attributed to a certain value is in line with its real content; each process is attributed to a steady flow, the deployment of which was possible only within certain scientific predefined semantic framework. The world rationally organized system with multiple elements, logic thinking which looked like sequence borrowed from scientific thinking. Therefore, the entire educational process was seen as a multi-acquainted with the realities of the world where, say, the lesson was seen as a programmed flow of information. The purpose of education was to create a narrow specialist for order fulfillment industrial society [12]. As we see, once causality rationality, which first established itself in classical science, and was implemented extrapolated to the classical education system, bypassing many social factors shaping the consciousness of the individual samples for reasoning about "consistent" image of the world [6, p. 179–180].

However, problem-predictive field of contemporary philosophy of education significantly conditioned primarily ontological context of life and creative personal fulfillment in the realities of globalization, especially the peculiar relationship human existence and being of society, including the social world of human existence, as levels of human and social relations and their development trends [15, p. 24–25]. That is why the philosophy of education is designed primarily to comprehend the true human existence in its problems and contradictions. In this context, the methodological importance "way givens of existence" (Heidegger), form of human existence in the world, its "ambivalence" (Lat. *Ambo* – and both *valentia* – force), the duality of experiences (both positive and negative, good and evil) and the relation to another person (object, phenomenon) [16]. Thus, the requirement of consistency in methodological aspects of modern approaches to attract ideological and value potential social rights involves primarily the need for socio-philosophical analysis of social life of modern man, levels of human relationships and society and their development trends [3].

It is clear that taken for analysis in the context of our work in a very broad sense, the concept of "sociality" makes reference to methodological developments socio-philosophical science that are able to clarify the content and give significance to it. One of the models proposed in the monograph of V. Voronkova "Philosophy of modern society: theoretical and methodological context" allows to

modify the structural relationship of human and social world in sufficiently high abstract-reflective levels that might be considered problematic planes and philosophy of education because due to its abstraction, some measure of uncertainty, society acts in this model as "pure" reflexive-concentrated embodiment of essence of human existence. As in society as in the system-structural holistic world embodied the very structuring of social life, and limited the integrity of the structure and its main elements, and hence some determination, functional connections of these elements, which include the main trends development and operation of the system as integrity, is the most compelling feature of society can be regarded as defining it as a social organism [2]. On the other hand, society is, in fact, as a routine records and sporadically-specific, directly felt by the individual world of social existence.

Researcher rightly observes that when combine all three levels of society in the light of the consideration due from each of them being very specific rights, such analysis would be extremely innovative [3] This approach made it possible to isolate human reflection in public three levels: 1) the substantial human abstract – a man in his general deep, so to speak, in qualitative and pure determination; 2) human sociological and functional – a man in his sign of those that ensure the existence and functioning of society as a system-the whole organism; 3) human existential individual – a person immersed in a world of everyday life and anthropological measurements [3, p. 105]. Socio-philosophical analysis provided by the reflective model made it possible to conclude that between man and the world of social life are three pairs of anthropologic and social relationship, where each level corresponds rights, correlated with the level of human social life in these ways: 1) the ratio of man as abstract and substantial subject and society; 2) the ratio of sociologically-functional individual and society as a system-the whole organism; 3) the ratio of existential individual rights and social worlds of everyday life [3, p. 105]. Although analysis demonstrated relations "man-society" is a purely methodological nature, this design enables mental comprehension (to some extent) the general principles of value for the individual and society in the context of our problem helps determine the actual plane problem of harmonization of education to develop strategies and tactics to overcome contradictions.

The first set of relationships – a relationship abstract substantial rights, on the one hand, and society – on the other. Of course, society as such – it's just an abstract universal, abstract and vague implement social life of man as such, overlooking the more specific characteristics of life. A person creates a society and realized it: society, whatever it may be, whatever their party is revealed, always includes any

human element, he expresses, embodies human nature, human immanence. However, to adequately understand the process of implementing substantial rights in society, should pay attention to the well-known fact that a person because of their spiritual and fundamental impulses of his active life immanent able to make your own content to give a double life, life immanent, and lives a life as separate from themselves. Note that important for our study indicated side of the dichotomy is a statement that the society itself, this ratio is a palpable embodiment of human principles, because the deepest substantial basis and is, in fact, a man. The above makes it possible to determine socium as man's other being"... as a society in the sense of the word appears as another man that I am. Value is the person and society is a kind of inherent contradictions of the man"[3, p. 106].

According to the model, the second set of relationships – a relationship of man as sociologically functional entity, on the one hand, and society as a system-structural whole organism – on the other. Society no longer appears as an abstract and substantial nature, as well as substantial uncertainty as much more concrete level of social life, which is inherent in certain clearly marked integrity, with its fixed structural elements, complex relationships between them. Society outlined in section – a complete organism associated with the generalization of established ways of life of communities of different cultures and different levels of order, a kind of integration of social forms of human existence. As noted by V. Voronkov, the person in this set of relations is not the bearer of abstract principles palpable and manifests itself in so their level, where it expressed characteristics associated with society as a system-structural whole. Therefore, a person at this level should be characterized as a social and functional entity whose activities are related to the functioning of the system-integrated social organism, which to some extent depends on it and determined it [3, p. 106].

Not detailing the macro level induced interaction, we point out the undeniable role and importance of adequate assessment of structuring society as the integrity and design of its elements in particular, are rather independent substructures that are necessary for further correction reflective of their interaction and thus predicting educational influences on social people this level relations that already appears as a kind of functional value, i.e. its vital functions normally provides an optimal functioning of the social organism, where the life is determined as a function of life, the development of social structures and substructures. While on the historical and scientific point of view anthropocentric factor of the opposition seems to us an absolute dominant because, as rightly observes V. Voronkov, "...in order to exist, optimally operated and maintained public

structure requires constant human energy, human livelihoods, which has a functional nature, "but it is at the level of human value" as sociologically-functional subject and society as a system-structural body practically carried domination of society (original, mediated mainly ideology and politics – L. A.) over a man – namely, society is the force that "rule" over the person and to some extent forms of instruction, orientation and values" [3, p. 107].

Today close attention humanistic oriented Humanity and educational sector given the relationship between society and man as "human subjects, dependent on society and the subordinate, subject, serving its subsystems and is subject to its requirements" [3, p. 107], requires the most correct methodological support the rationalization process of understanding the basic aspects of the above "socio-generic" addiction.

The third set of human relationships – those seemingly doomed to domination as personal values – relations existential-individual, in the context of which, in fact, there is interdependence and individual social world. However, it is in this area – in a relationship where a person acts not abstract and substantial entity, not arithmetic element of human diversity, nation, class, and there are unique person in a relationship, where it turns feature and fullness of human existence – significant difficulties fulfillment lays. As noted by V. Voronkov, it is in this set of relations, where man finds himself in a unique, individual characteristics, in his life-existential immediacy (for Heidegger) and is rooted in his being, in their homes, in their community, initially- existential relationship that is determined by the values, meanings, values that are vital basis of human existence, which come to the fore the unique characteristics of individual rights, meanings, significance and values that are vital basis of its existence – thanks to its own subjective world everyday life can dominate the person, draw it in the routine of everyday life [3, p. 107].

As already mentioned, in terms of the information age, when man's relationship to the world of social life is constantly changing qualitatively and quantitatively, that subjective factors and differences form the variety, which is some units and elements of systemic unity of the human relationship to the world. That is why in philosophical terms specified unity diversity is seen as a reflection of multidimensionality rights that incorporates level differences of human relationship to the world, based on these differences, grows out of this diversity and it embodies in itself. Thus, the task of a detailed theoretical and methodological studies man as a complex social and at the same time integrated in its immediate being beings is to analyze the differences and internal communication of the above mentioned planes formation in social and individual personality. For our study is important are the following points:

a) due to the action of three tendencies of man's relationship to the world of social being formed some triad: people within the first set of relations dominates the world; within the second – it is subject to the; within the third – is a kind of synthesis – the creation of man the world dependence on him, conquering him. These three groups interdependencies relations occur together and are inseparable from each other; they form a single complex trend, the comprehension of which, of course, requires the synthesis of methodological approaches; b) process can be isolating trend are characterized as human phenomenon when the first level human relations beginning in the substantial sense abstract presented poorly dissolved in substantiality of general human relations in the second system it appears more clearly in the mass being functional in its striving to sociality, in its role of serving as the third level human relations is revealed in its direct (pure) form.

As you can see, the man in the relationship with the world speaks holistic and multifaceted subject. Its multidimensionality is extremely complex problem and a methodological analysis of human cognition levels of support, in fact, the "human dimension principle" – the principle of correspondence feedback "social rights" and "tribal rights" that appears in the socialization process (with acquisition of knowledge, values, formation of life-activity principles and awareness of the social significance of his life, including in the process of professional education), makes it possible to reflect the complexity of the versatility and richness of differences, even contradictions approaches to the analysis of the actual person as complex social beings, as quite acceptable in the humanities phenomenon, despite the great diversity of approaches.

So, we believe structured social and philosophical reflection ideological and value potential of social factors of education is consistent with the requirements of postnonclassical rationality. However, it is able to attract the basis of moral values and form factors of heuristic and prognostic potential of modern education. This will allow determination of trends and prospects methodological research in the field of philosophy of education, particularly that anthropological orientation with direct professional activities of the modern teacher.

References

1. Andrushchenko, V. (2005). Higher education in post-Bologna space: attempt of prognostic analysis. *Philosophy of education*, 2, 6–19 [in Ukrainian]
2. Bekh, V. P. (2000). *Genesis of the country's social organism*. Zaporizhzhya: Prosvita [in Ukrainian].
3. Voronkova, V. H. (2012). *Philosophy of modern society development: theoretical-methodological*

- context : monograph. Zaporizhzhya : ZSIA [in Ukrainian].
4. Dzvinchuk, D. (2007). Development of educational systems in 20th century and new demands of 21st century. *Higher education of Ukraine*, 1, 27—35 [in Ukrainian].
 5. Dobronravova, I. (2005). Philosophy of education in the epoch of postnonclassical science. *Philosophy of education*, 1, 116—125 [in Ukrainian].
 6. Dol'skaya, O. A. (2009). *Representations of rationality in the field of education: monograph*. Kharkov : KNURE [in Ukrainian].
 7. Cassirer, E. (1998). An essay on man. Introduction into philosophy of human culture. *Selected works. An essay on man*. Moscow : Gardarika [in Russian].
 8. Korsak, K. V. (2006). *Social-philosophical analysis of tendencies of the triad "man—society—education" development in early 21st century : abstract of thesis for the degree of Doctor of philosophical sciences: 09.00.10*. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
 9. Kremen', V. H. (2007). *Philosophy of the national idea. Man. Education. Socium*. Kyiv : Hramota [in Ukrainian].
 10. Lutai, V. S. (2001). Proactive movement (Reforming of the higher education on the basis of establishing philosophical-methodological paradigm of the postnonclassical science). *Higher education in Ukraine*, 2, 33—43 [in Ukrainian].
 11. Marek, K. (2001). Globalization and higher education. *Higher education*, 4, 5—12 [in Ukrainian].
 12. Novikov, A. M. (2008). *Postindustrial education*. Moscow : Publishing House «Egves» [in Russian].
 13. Predbors'ka, I. M. (1996). *Theory of social change: social-philosophical analysis : thesis of Doctor of philosophical sciences : 09.00.03*. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
 14. Predbors'ka, I. M. (1995). *Changeability, socium, man : monograph*. Sumy : Slobozhanshchyna [in Ukrainian].
 15. Stepin, V. S. (1999). Problem of axiological basis of modern education : Philosophy, culture and education (proceedings of the round-table discussion). *Issues of philosophy*, 3, 24—25 [in Russian].
 16. Scheler, M. (1992). Forms of knowledge and education. *Chelovek*, 5, 63—75 [in Russian].

Information about the author:
Afanasyeva Lyudmyla Vasylivna

lyudmilasocio@rambler.ru
 Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky State Pedagogical
 University,
 20 Lenin Street, Melitopol,
 72312, Ukraine.

doi: 10.7905/vers.v1i3.803
 Received at the editors' office: 10.09.2013.
 Accepted for publishing: 20.10.2013.

Translation: Viktoriia Kotliarova

