

RAISING OF THE MAN OF CULTURE: CULTUROLOGICAL INTENTIONS OF THE NEW EDUCATIONAL METHODOLOGY

Maryna Bud'ko, Olena Troits'ka
Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky State Pedagogical University

Annotations:

Будько Марина, Троїцька Олена. Виховання людини культури: культурологічні інтенції нової освітньої методології

Вбачаючи причини освітньої кризи в декогеренції освітнього та культурного середовищ, автори прагнуть довести, що створення нової освітньої методології, адекватної викликам часу, можливе лише на основі розуміння культури як ціннісно-символічного підмур'я освіти й за умови залучення філософією освіти методологічного та понятійного апарату культурологічної науки. Якщо філософія освіти покликана сформувати світоглядний базис, визначити цілі, завдання й алгоритми їх розв'язання, то завдання культурології сьогодні – визначити для системи освіти систему координат, прокласти маршрути і вказати напрям руху в них, який би збігався зі спрямованістю саморозвитку культурної системи. Тільки за умови такої взаємоспрямованості, взаємопідтримки та взаємодоповнення шляхом подолання «роздільної інституціалізації» філософії, освіти й культури можливе створення умов для повноцінного функціонування освітньої системи як інструмента культури, а значить – і реалізації «культурних» функцій освіти як системного ядра єдиного культурно-освітнього простору.

Будько Марина, Троицкая Елена. Воспитание человека культуры: культурологические интенции новой образовательной методологии

Усма тривая причины образовательного кризиса в декогеренции образовательной и культурной сред, авторы стремятся доказать, что создание новой образовательной методологии, адекватной вызовам времени, возможно только на основе понимания культуры как ценностно-символического фундамента образования и при условии привлечения философией образования методологического и понятийного аппарата культурологической науки. Если философия образования призвана сформировать мировоззренческий базис, определить цели, задачи и методы их решения, то задача культурологии сегодня – определить для системы образования систему координат, проложить маршруты и указать направление движения в них, которое бы совпадало с направленностью саморазвития культурной системы. Только при условии такой взаимонаправленности, взаимоподдержки и взаимодополняемости путем преодоления «раздельной институциализации» философии, образования и культуры возможно создание условий для полноценного функционирования образовательной системы как инструмента культуры, а значит – и реализации «культурных» функций образования как системного ядра единого культурно-образовательного пространства.

Bud'ko Maryna, Troits'ka Olena. Raising of the man of culture: culturological intentions of the new educational methodology

Seeing the causes of the educational crisis in decogeneration of educational and cultural environment, the authors are trying to prove that creation of the new educational methodology, adequate to the challenges of time, is possible only on the basis of understanding culture as a value-symbolic foundation of education and under conditions when philosophy of education attracts the methodological and conceptual apparatus of the cultural science. If the philosophy of education is to form the worldview basis, define the goals, tasks and algorithms of their solution, then the task of culturology nowadays is to determine the frame of reference for the system of education, lay the route and show the direction of further movement, which will coincide with the direction of cultural system's self-development. Only under conditions of such inter-directedness, mutual support and inter – complementarity by means of overcoming "separate institutionalization" of philosophy, education and culture it is possible to create conditions for full-fledged functioning of the educational system as an instrument of culture, hence for realization of the "cultural" functions of education as a system core of the single cultural-educational space.

Key words:

культура, освіта, культурно-освітній простір, людина культури.

культура, образование, культурно-образовательное пространство, человек культуры.

culture, education, cultural-educational space, a man of culture.

The idea of cultural relevance is not new in education, but only due to the urgent necessity of forming a new strategy of education development (in history of culture it happens every time as one cultural epoch succeeds another – from the necessity of a new arrangement of the world of culture and rethinking the place and role of education in it) it comes out of its context, implicit state and reveals itself turning into the constructive paradigm. The proof of “the cultural bias” in modern philosophical-educational studies is actualization of problems connected with inter-cultural communication, cultural dominance and national educational policy, concepts of poly-cultural sensitivity and multi-culturalism, tasks for preserving cultural diversity and upbringing in the spirit of national community, escalation of westernization tendencies within national educational cultures and fundamentalism threats, problems of cultural and upbringing interests

of sub-cultures within the common educational space etc.

Orienting towards culture under the conditions of “shifting the epicenter of the whole human existence to the pole of culture” (V. Bibler) – is a new type of pedagogical conscience which has been actively developing for the recent decade in former Soviet Union area and has determined the implementation of a new notion “cultural-educational space” (Ye. Bondarevs'ka, O. Bermus, L. Novykov, L. Khoron'ko and others) into the system of pedagogical learning, – with the help of this notion the scientific community tries to rethink the phenomenon of education in the broad cultural context at various levels of its realization: world educational space, educational spaces of a country, region, municipal society, single educational institution, and finally – the educational space of a personality.

System of culture – in case of understanding the laws of its construction and development, – may (and is called by its nature) become the system of axes and guide for education in the complex and unbalanced world, and the latter explains the increase of attention to the problems of culture from the side of philosophy of education which perseveringly speaks about the “culturalized” learning [3, p. 61]. Considering the above and seeing the reasons of the educational crisis in the decoherention of the educational and cultural spaces we will make an attempt within the given research to define from the positions of philosophy of education the prospects of philosophy, education and culture integration on the basis of understanding the culture as the value and symbolic foundation of education.

The list of culturological problems that are gradually filling the problem field of philosophy of education is consistently extending, as well as possible ways of their solution, and their analysis – though even cursory – greatly exceeds the possibilities of a single research. Hence, we will use the culturological generalizations of those circumstances which prove the relevance of the culturological learning and culturological approach to the reforming of the educational space – its “culturologization” – aiming at turning into the cultural-educational one [5]. First, it should be noted that culture in the modern contradictory and conflict world (together with the keen demographic situation, under the conditions of hyper-urbanization, significant irregularity of population density and mass migration, escalation of conflicts in the most trouble-free regions etc.) forms up those creative mechanisms which can prevent expanding of aggression and ruinous tendencies. These mechanisms are to be revealed, studied and we ought to learn how to master their possibilities.

No less important is the fact that under the conditions of globalization expanding in the world scale one can observe the reinforcement of tendencies connected with the crisis of identity, social marginalization of society. In this situation culturological awareness that favours the apprehension of the cultural worlds specificity, the role of values and norms, laws of cultural development which are based on the harmonious interaction between the tradition and innovation and make the communication procedures easier encourages establishing of one’s own identity, including social and political ones. Quite implicit seems the fact that in the situations of anthropogenic crisis which is due to the man’s inability to manage his own technology-related power the cost of risk may be significantly lowered due to the use of modern ways of the socio-cultural dynamics modeling, which are based on the scientific resource accumulated in the socio-humanitarian awareness; besides, culturological education gives a possibility

to realize that society development is possible only in the situation when the culture itself is developing in a harmonious way. Finally, it should be noted that the critical condition of modern society is considerably connected with the deficiency of understanding, and at present times culturology is nearly the only discipline which forms not only the moral sides of personality or worldview positions, or value beliefs, or the man’s ability to perceive the environment as the integrity, – but is also immediately oriented towards the formation of ability to understand this complex and contradictory world, express one’s own attitude to it and behave according to the socio-cultural context [5].

The problem of education and culture integration attracts broad circles of researchers to the scientific discussion, including specialists in the field of philosophy of education. It is demonstrative that the prominent Russian philosopher V. Rozanov stressed the absence of studies of such a direction as far as 1899: “We do not have and did not have what can be called philosophy of upbringing and education, i.e. discussion of education itself, upbringing itself in the line of other cultural factors, and also in their relation to the eternal features of the human nature and to the constant tasks of history” [9, p. 601]. However, considerable interest to culture as a meaningful phenomenon for education and upbringing is traditionally peculiar to pedagogy, above all that the social and individual spaces, historical and personal time of man’s existence are filled with the phenomena of culture: objects, relations, values, information, technologies etc. At the same time culture appears to be both the content of education and its major means, and the most important educational and pedagogic task. The man’s cultural experience – the constant background of his active life – to a great extent determines the peculiarities of communication and behavior, the level of spiritual longings, criteria of self-esteem, and also it concretizes the tasks for education and upbringing of a real man and the ways of their realization. Culture not only generates new pedagogical values – spirituality, dialogueness, co-existence etc., – but also appears the prototype, invariant of organization and self-organization of education which shows more and more intention to obtain cultural relevance. Thus, for the institute of education reinforcement of “cultural” functions becomes the condition of its further productive development as a sphere of cultural practice which provides the quality of social and personal self-awareness.

On the other hand, it is education and upbringing which define the fate of certain cultures either encouraging their preservation or destruction (vs conservation or modernization, integrity or patchiness, elitism or mass character...). Values which are fostered in man in the course of education

and upbringing, participation in culture creation encourage establishing the integrity of his knowledge, morality, spirituality and personal culture. Education represents a specific model of culture while being the microcosm where the main phenomena and processes which either have already happened or are lasting, or are expected in culture, accumulate, get ripen or are displayed. Hence, culture and education co-exist as the parallel worlds (macro- and microcosm), they not only reflect each other, but generate the processes which are able to develop in the parallel world; their interrelations can be qualified as sense-engendering or form-engendering (with the accent on *inter-*). Therefore, not only the analysis of the culture phenomenon for education as a necessary attribute of any culture is a factor of self-knowing and system of axes. The opposite is also true. In education like in a mirror the culture is able to see itself, perceive and improve, “working out” in this microcosm like in the lab the projects of self-establishing, self-improvement and perhaps, (considering the present character of global calls) – rescue.

Culture and education are the spheres in and through which the process of the man’s formation and development is carried out. The entire culture is aimed at the formation of personality which is capable owing to his actions to embody and develop the living experience accumulated by the human community, – it is the essence of culture, and its structure is determined by this fact. But culture also expresses its essence by forming special activity which purpose is the expression of culture mission. This activity has been embodied by pedagogical activity which has always been perceived as a special cultural practice through the historical process. The essence of any education is the transfer of culture patterns, “cultivation” of man (M. Bakhtin). “Paideia” (Greek παιδεία – the formation of a child, education, upbringing, culture – is a notion of the Classic philosophy that means the universal scholarship; cf. with Latin *humanitas* – the universal scholarship as the essence of man that meant the way (managing the way, its organization), which the man was destined to go through, changing himself towards the ideal of spiritual and physical perfection; “the meaning of the man’s “second birth” and the place of a teacher in this act is emphasized nearly in all the cultures” [1, p. 57].

Philosophers, pedagogues and cultural studies scholars at the end of 20th century came to the mutual conclusion as for the crisis of the European culture and civilization which despite their considerable achievements fail to provide peaceful, happy and harmonious life both for man and the mankind. But while the talks about the future are being held it has already come. We can see it through the changes in politics and economics, culture and society, individual and social relations, life style models

and its standards: “Future goes at its prey from the ambush laid in the long ago lived-in past and present order of things. Due to this fact the modern man constantly lives in the state of stress. Every minute he faces the future without realizing it and experiences the most severe psychological discomfort... Future comes much faster than in the previous epochs” [7, p. 6]. According to the shrewd remark of O. Genis, one reality “runs into” another right in front of our eyes. It makes an impression of an absolute chaos but at close examination one can see certain logics in this folly and it becomes evident that it is necessary (and possible) to prepare for the encounter with future, with “tomorrow”, with new reality. Moreover, it is necessary and possible to prepare this future, in particular and firstly through the system of education, the education which is in accordance with the new cultural configuration.

In case the culture stopped being normative, canonical, oriented at the humane ideal of a perfect personality, and in education its logic stopped to coincide with the logic of culture construction (it is the evident display of cultural and educational environment decoherence), then what other core are they capable to find for performing the role of the organizational foundation? A great amount of philosophical schools and teachings being in opposition to each other give rise to a great number of logically grounded conceptions which in a different way correlate the worldview with science, culture, religion. Such a situation in the ontological line of “education – culture” is called “the worldview troubled years” [2, p. 32–37]. It should be added that profound and principal changes in all the spheres of man’s living not only raise new philosophical problems but actualize the old, “classical” ones, which solution under the new cultural bearings demand the cardinally new interpretation. It is evident that the necessity has ripened to develop the worldview which would take into consideration both those changes that have already happened, and the specificity of maturing “the embryo” of the new world, at this it would not reject the fundamental grounds of the cultural heritage. So much the more the main idea of the new philosophical ethos is to develop such a kind of philosophizing which would evade the borderline positions, equally hazardous for the peace and cooperation, and would protect the culture from diffusion and unification.

The search for the new worldview-philosophical paradigm capable not only for adequate rethinking of modern reality but producing strategies of management for the present existence and construction of future make the sense of the newest philosophy. We can observe actualization of more and more ideas connected with the establishing of the non-linear worldview and its translation with the help of culture and education mechanisms. Thus, under the conditions of transfer to a new educational

society with the new non-classical intelligence one can observe the rise of importance ascribed to non-classical approaches, non-classical science and non-classical nature in general, which try to create the new interpretation and the new synthesis of philosophy, education and culture. Besides, alongside with call-outs to renew and improve methodological, conceptual and terminological apparatus of the theory of education, one can hear the optimistic voices of the proponents of sensible adaptation of the philosophical-pedagogical views which have already been formed in order to solve the contemporary problems of upbringing and education, that cannot but comfort considering the intended break in the pedagogical culture in the line of “traditions – innovations”.

Hence, there comes the natural question what the space of contemporary conceptual representation of the institute of education must be like, for common for us images of the “subject teacher”, “pupil”, “class”, “lesson” (“teacher”, “student”, “classroom”) and highly specialized, organized in a hierarchic way knowledge are the core components of the educational process and nodal points of the educational space structure which was formed at dawn of the Modern time by the efforts of Komensky, Pestalozzi and other outstanding pedagogues and remains unchanged till our days. It should be stressed that such logic of the educational space organization was determined and born “in the image and likeness” of the Modern time culture, the culture that is rational, branch-like, specialized, encyclopedical, and which in order to translate and develop itself created in the system of education “its own lesson” and its own methods for each cultural branch. “The type of mass school corresponds to the type of mass social practice. The industrial type of school corresponds to the industrial society, – says O. Novykov. – Mass education used to be a brilliant mechanism designed by industrialism in order to create such type of people which it needed. The idea of collecting the masses of pupils (raw material) for the teachers (workers) to influence them in corporately-settled schools (factories) was an achievement of an industrial genius. The industrial type of society produced a certain type of education, certain education institutions of its time” [7, p. 37].

Such model of education was adequate and progressive in the Modern time; it fruitfully existed for several centuries and gradually became asymmetric to those social changes which were accumulated in geometric progression. Later, thanks to E. Fromm’s good graces it was compared with the model of factory, conveyer which delivers knowledge to a pupil cut and dried, producing a kind of packages with “all-round” knowledge. As we can see, the sphere of education is not only dimensional micro-image of culture but also time information channel through which culture translates the main

contents for itself so that to make it an acquisition of a certain individual and the foundation of his activity, and through them to return this contents into the culture again having been tested and corrected according to the environment changes. Thus, it becomes evident that this channel can function effectively only if its structure corresponds to the structure of culture, logics of its material organization, and realized prospects of development. Otherwise, communicative disorders are inevitable. In case we consider that the construction of educational space must correspond to the logics of culture, then it is necessary to peer into the features of modern culture (both evident and hardly noticeable) in order to see the principles of the new educational architecture in it.

The global crisis of education under the conditions of the change of epochs is the empirically fixed fact that demonstrates the rise of interest to philosophical and fundamentally culturological problems for the post-modern paradigm of the educational process to be substantiated. One of the features of the crisis is the loss of cultural grounds of pedagogical activity and the sense of belonging to any not only ethnic or national, but also professional-educational culture in general. Education and upbringing in mass practice is realized partially by intuition, spontaneously or behind the cultural field of profession, and “what do the examples of teachers’ ignorance, cruelty and pedagogical impotence serve for?” [1, p. 57]. According to I. Kolesnykova’s figurative expression, in time of democratization and liberalization of society in the field of pedagogy the opposition of “the sacred and secular” disappears [4, p. 99–106].

Currently education has practically lost its most important function – formation of cultural self-awareness, – setting before itself a task just to prepare a person for the professional activity, impart the knowledge accumulated in the past but not to find meaning in the core spiritual-moral problems of today which appear under the conditions of cultural globalization. Such a tendency is dangerous because, at first, specialization and understanding education as a number of “competences” are not much conform to the necessity of the integral perception of the world of culture. The character of education and upbringing which is still techno-centric (at evident declarativity and/or formalism of the humanitarization process) determines their focus exclusively at usefulness, but not spiritual development of an individual, at the modern sense of life – without any cultural orientating points, without considering the urgent needs of tomorrow and past values. Such character of education (more exact educational culture) correlates, in our opinion, with the configurative type of culture in the conception of M. Mead [6]: this culture is undifferentiated, shallow, but flexible and open; man lives “here and now”, his aims and intentions

are pragmatic, he is restricted in knowledge, skills and values, takes life changes for granted, he is not interested in “yesterday” and he sees “tomorrow” in broad lines. Unfortunately, it is the configurative features which are passive to development and indifferent to the content that are in a great deal proper for the present post-Soviet system of education which rejecting the social values of the Soviet epoch failed to distinguish them from the cultural values in time.

As for the future values they have not been determined yet and lacking worthy orienting points we forgetting about the global scale of the cultural crisis (perhaps due to the national character – a neighbor has sweeter apples) often borrow them from foreign (mostly western) sources or just are limited to ready educational schemes which have been developed and tested in other socio-cultural conditions by other pedagogical traditions and for a person with a different worldview. Here it is worth noting that in the most circumferential and therefore most dynamic sub-system of culture – economics – in view of the “superiority right” certain experience of tries and mistakes have been accumulated and it is not indifferent to the “nuclear” cultural spheres, one of which is education. We mean reinforcement of the line in sociology and economical theory (firstly in institutional) which is connected with consideration of mistakes that have been accumulated recently and caused, first of all, by inability or unwillingness to test the offered reforms as for their combinability with certain social priorities, value orienting points and cultural traditions, introduction into the way of thinking and the world view of a certain community. However, identical ideas are also aired in pedagogy but the voices of proponents of their own way of development, cultural relevance of educational system as the relevance to the home cultural tradition are still being lost in vigorous and culturally insensitive chorus of the “Bologna revolution” adepts.

One can hardly hear quite relevant remarks that orientation of the Soviet educational system at the formation of an all-rounded personality determined the type of education which was absolutely different from its western industrial analogues with its fundamentality, many-sidedness and profoundness of the humanitarian component. Thus, implicit orientation at the “reorganization of such type of education is evidently a serious strategic mistake” [7, p. 38]. Moreover, this fundamentality (which is not completely lost by older generations) could give us some advantages for the new type if education formation, as we have incomparable experience of training not only an “intellectual”, but a “refined person”.

This way or that, but we can observe a gradual understanding of the fact what a fundamental role in educational transformation processes the factors

of spiritual and cultural character play, the role of the man in cultural processes is also being reconsidered. There is no doubt that educational innovations are sustainable only in case of their correctness as for the worldview ideas and cultural symbols of a certain society and ability for the organic joining the cultural system. At the same time the majority of modern pedagogical borrowings do not have, in our opinion, the proper coherence level with the domestic cultural system in general and educational one in particular. As a result the misfortunes of the majority of pedagogical innovations in modern educational process at the attempts to form and develop “education of the post-industrial type” are firstly connected with inability to provide these innovations with adequate value-symbolic foundation for the man’s conscience is always ethnically determined. Lacking such a foundation all the efforts directed at the schemes borrowed from a different socio-cultural context inevitably appear to be less effective (and to a certain degree even harmful) than educational and instructive actions that lean against the organic foundation representing a certain way of life. Besides, intensive or poorly controlled borrowings, on the one hand, increase the potential threat for the community to lose its cultural distinctive character, as it is known that the panhuman culture exists just as a certain abstraction, in real life we deal with precise national and ethnic forms, and, on the other hand, they slow down the transformation processes, partially through the impossibility to “implant” innovations into a certain socio-cultural environment.

At the same time, information and technical potential of educational and pedagogic technologies in modern Ukrainian education is used mostly afterwards for the man to get adapted to the life conditions that have already been changed, i.e. education exclusively acts as a translator of contemporary culture content. At this influential layers of the traditional culture (world, national, ethnic, religious, professional) stay less demanded as a means of educational and pedagogic influence on a young man’s conscience, and the same concerns the cultural experience of a number of generations (in particular the experience of crisis situations overcoming). At this very point the conflict arises between the modernity and tradition, between factual life necessities and metaphysical grasp of eternal principles of existence, necessity of man’s involvement in cultural ideas of the bygone epochs. It raises no doubts that lacking the most profound philosophical and culturological revision of the problems connected with basic principles, goals and tasks of the educational process it is impossible to reform the system of education completely neither on the national level nor on the global one.

To grasp in full the tendencies of development and to correct one’s positions relevantly – that is the task which has always been important for education.

The challenge of the new century lies in the fact that it is necessary to realize the deepest grounds and grasp the driving forces of the human civilization development, moreover to influence these factors in order to achieve moral and spiritual progress of the global society. Undoubtedly, the Ukrainian education that has already perceived itself the part of the world one is being rebuilt to a certain degree trying a great many of pedagogical innovations (certainly claiming innovations). But by now speaking of these innovations as well as of all educational policy we can apply a figurative expression used by O. Novykov to describe similar changes in Russian education: they “remind of the attempts to improve the kerosene lamp at the time when electricity has long existed” [7, p. 6]. Ukrainian researchers are unanimous with them: “Reforms in any system (including the system of education) if uncertain as for aims and qualities of the system functioning can be identified with “navigation by the wind spinner” after the reforms accomplishment, though any navigation has its purpose and implies that the route for its achievement is determined” [8, p. 216]. Nowadays we do not need separate pedagogical innovations, but realization of the new – cultural – model of education, cardinal changes of the worldview called to awaken the natural functions of the system of education as the most important attribute of culture, the main channel of cultural experience translation, instrument of formation, correction and if necessary transition of personal mentality and socium in a symmetric and harmonious way in accordance with cultural dynamics processes. Realization of the cultural function implies reorienting the system of education towards raising the man of culture.

Finally, we would mention that complete solution of this task is possible on condition of engaging the methodological and conceptual apparatus of the modern culturological science. If philosophy of education is called to determine goals, tasks and algorithms of their solution, then the task of modern culturology is to define the system of cultural bearings for the system of education, to lay the routes and indicate the direction which would coincide with the direction of the cultural system self-development. Only on condition of such a mutual direction, mutual support and mutual addition by the way of overcoming “separate institutionalization” of education and culture it is possible to create conditions for complete functioning of the system of education as a culture instrument, and hence realization of “cultural” functions of education as the system core of entire cultural-educational space.

References

1. Alioshina, S. A. (2012). Interrelation of culture and pedagogical activity as historical-pedagogical problem. *Reporter of Orenburg State Pedagogical*

- University*,1(1), 57—66, viewed 15.04.14, <http://www.vestospu.ru> [in Russian]
2. Arutiunyan, M. (2004). Worldview and education: establishment of a new paradigm. *Higher education in Russia*. 12, 32—37 [in Russian].
3. Bekh, V. P. and Shalimova, Ye. O. (2009). *Functional model of personality: in search of politicocultural determinants of behaviour: monograph*. Kyiv: M. P. Drahomanov National Pedagogical University Press [in Ukrainian]
4. Kolesnikova, I. A. (2011). Historical-cultural dimension of pedagogical profession. *Historical-pedagogical journal*, 3, 99—106 [in Russian].
5. Kostina, A. V. (2009). Higher culturological education in 21st century: prospects of development. *Knowledge. Understanding. Skills: information humanitarian portal*, 11, viewed 15.04.14, <http://www.zpu-journal.ru/e-zpu/2009/11/Kostina/> [in Russian].
6. Mead, M. (1988). *Culture and the world of childhood: Selected works*. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
7. Novikov, A. M. (2008). *Post-industrial education*. Moscow: Publishing House «Egves» [in Russian].
8. *Image of the man of future: Who and How should be brought up in new generations: collective monograph* (2011). (Bazaluk, O. A., Ed). V. 1. Kiev: Kondor [in Russian].
9. Rozanov, V. V. (1990). *Twilight of enlightenment*. Moscow: Pedagogika [in Russian].

Information about the authors:

Bud'ko Maryna Vasylivna

budko_marina@ukr.net

Troits'ka Olena Mykhailivna

troizka@ukr.net

Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky State Pedagogical University,
20 Lenin Street, Melitopol,
72312, Ukraine.

doi:10.7905/vers.v1i3.804

Received at the editors' office: 11.10.2013.

Accepted for publishing: 09.11.2013.

Translation: Natalia Zinenko

