

## WORLDVIEW BASIS OF EDUCATION: A PHILOSOPHICAL SEARCH OF UNIVERSALITY

Lyubov Vorobyova

*National State Tax Service University of Ukraine*

### Annotations:

**Воробйова Любов. Світоглядна основа освіти: філософський пошук універсальності**

Концептуалізовано антропологічного обґрунтування глобалізаційних змін в освіті засобами філософії освіти, оскільки саме освіта є одним з основних культурних інститутів, що впливають на спрямованість еволюції людини не лише на рівні окремих спільнот, а й загалом на рівні людства як єдиного виду. Філософський підхід до аналізу цих процесів дає змогу виявити основні тенденції, які сформувалися в минулому людства, та ті перспективи, що з'являються з огляду на сучасний стан справ в освіті, осмисленій як єдина система в глобальних масштабах. Обґрунтовано положення про те, що в основу філософських і спеціальнонаукових теорій освіти, а також позанаукових уявлень про неї, покладені різні типи світогляду.

**Воробьева Любовь. Мировоззренческая основа образования: философский поиск универсальности**

Концептуализирована антропологического обоснования глобализационных изменений в образовании средствами философии образования, поскольку именно образование является одним из основных культурных институтов, влияющих на направленность эволюции человека не только на уровне отдельных сообществ, но и в целом на уровне человечества как единого вида. Философский подход к анализу данных процессов позволяет выявить основные тенденции, сформировавшиеся в прошлом человечества, и те перспективы, которые появляются с учетом современного состояния дел в образовании, осмысленном как единая система в глобальных масштабах. Обосновано положение, что в основе как философских, так и специальнонаучных теорий образования, а также ненаучных представлений о нем находятся различные типы мировоззрения.

**Vorobyova Lyubov. Worldview basis of education: a philosophical search of universality**

The article conceptualizes the problem of the anthropological ground for the global changes in education by means of philosophy of education, since it is education which is one of the major cultural institutions directing the human evolution not just on the level of certain communities but on the level of the humanity as a single species in general. Philosophical approach to the analysis of the given processes allows determining the main tendencies which were formed in the past and those prospects which appear with regard to contemporary state of education conceived as a single system in the global scale. The author has proved the opinion that various types of worldview are the foundation of both philosophical and special scientific theories of education, and also non-scientific ideas of it.

### Key words:

світогляд, освіта, антропологічний вимір.

мировоззрение, образование, антропологическое измерение.

worldview, education, anthropological dimension.

Over the centuries the global human development, becoming integral and more interconnected by the common social world, has put forward the main imperative for the modern society by means of moving person in the epicenter of all events. Finding the ways and forms of active participation of the person in violation and the attempts to solve the social problems – from the local to the planetary level – actualize increasingly the task of such changes in education, when it will determine the fundamental controllability of the development of the mankind. In this perspective, there are more disputes than consensus at present. Not only in mass media but also in scientific research are common both of the aspects: the numerous speculations of the supporters of the hyper globalization, that consider the modern global changes as the discovery of a new era, and the warnings of "skeptics", for whom globalization is a myth that "covers" the essence of a gradual segmentation of the world. However, there is also more balanced perception of globalization as a necessary adaptation of the peoples to interdependent progress of the world community. It is typical for the "transformationalists", who, however, do not correspond to the philosophical universals, such as human development, culture, education, spirituality, the true creative content.

The scientific research of the globalization changes, revealing their essence in accordance

with the requirements of a specific scientific analysis, as a rule, focus on the objective aspects of globalization and its impact on the various spheres of society, that leaves the ontological determinants of these changes out of the detection of their anthropological dimension. Besides, the significant potential of the philosophical and educational thought regarding the anthropological understanding of the evolutionary educational changes is not used in full in different directions of the modernization of education. Most of the researchers recognize the leading feature of globalization its significant impact on society, on the personality of each subject of globalization, but in reality a new ideological system of ontological, gnoseological and axiological orientation does not correlate with the traditionally local, national processes, makes it difficult to harmonize relations between personality and new forms of sociality, of globalization.

The whole range of these contradictory tendencies actualizes the problem of the anthropological study of globalization changes in education. To conceptualize this issue one should primarily use the means of philosophy of education, because education is one of the major cultural institutions that influence the direction of the human evolution not only at the level of individual communities, but in general at the level of humanity as a single species, – therefore, the processes of globalization appear as the result

of the long historical processes. Philosophical approach to the analysis of these processes makes it possible to identify the main trends that have emerged in the past of mankind, and those prospects that appear taking into consideration the present state of affairs in education, realized as a single system on a global scale.

Philosophical study of the worldview is the generalized methodological basis of the detection of the human dimension in education. Education should not only be considered as an important element of socialization, but also as an integral part of any experience that embodies the fullness of the human worldview. From these positions carried out the conceptual reconstruction of the doctrine of experience in the philosophy of V. Dilthey, learning of values of H. Rickert and the doctrine of consciousness of K. Jaspers.

To research the anthropological dimension of education, following the doctrine of Wilhelm Dilthey ("Introduction to the Sciences of the Spirit"), one should address to the method of understanding as to the basic knowledge of human behavior and the fundamentals of functioning and development of the society [1, p. 38]. Not only the intellectual component of education, but all the fullness of the experience associated with its receipt, should be taken into account in the analysis of the anthropological dimension of education. Getting education, a person in the first place shapes his worldview, in which structure the cognitive, axiological, strong-willed, and other components are allocated. It is the worldview that forms the universal basis for experience, common for many generations, and the studies of anthropological dimension of education prove this fact.

It should be noted that V. Dilthey already gave a new meaning to the concept of versatility that acquire historical character. That means that philosophy has to identify the universal characteristics of the experience as they stand not for "all times and peoples", but for the specific society (or even an individual social group) in a certain historical period. Exactly such understanding of the versatility perceive most of the researchers worldview, not attempting to identify the universal worldview as an overhistorical variant, but trying to identify the universal characteristics of the worldview typical for a particular historical epoch.

Among all the meanings of philosophy and philosophy of a man, as one of its main branches, are broad in scope and the most profound is the worldview meaning of philosophy. Because in all of its other manifestations the philosophy of a man, in fact, appears to some extent as a specialized field, covering a relatively small number of people, as it requires proper professional training, practical training and a systematic and focused effort. Every human personality becomes familiar with philosophy

through outlook, as to the philosophy of a man attached, sometimes in unexpected ways and often without even knowing it, because he is a socio-historical, spiritual, intellectual creature. The worldview can be preliminary defined as a system of generalized views of the human world, nature and society, to other people and to himself, his place in the world and attitude to those things, processes, events, phenomena and creatures that are in it. The worldview is an indicator of the level and at the same time of the basic form of self-consciousness.

An important prerequisite of the determination of the identity of philosophy and the definition of this concept is the view of the fact that the subject, that is, a carrier, and an active, effective beginning of the worldview is seen only in the separate human individual. Although most of the time we are talking about the "human world", it should be borne in mind that the term "person" is used here in the diversity of their meanings. And the range of these meanings is very wide – from a single person (when it comes to man as an individual person) to humanity as a whole (if it is, for example, about the relation of man and nature, human and other biological genera or species, humans and other possible varieties of intellectual creatures etc). Therefore, the subject of the worldview can be (and is) every individual. His outlook is unique, and his uniqueness is stipulated by the uniqueness of each human individual. But actually the range of the worldviews is much richer, as the subjects of the worldview are not only individuals, but also the most diverse groups of people – social groups of different scale, ethnic and social groups, classes, societies, masses, humanity as a whole.

The conclusion about the inexhaustible variety of forms of the worldview seems quite natural to us. However, they can be differentiated according to the different criteria, such as historical eras (ancient world, the medieval worldview, the worldview of the Renaissance and others), according to the degree of self-awareness (natural worldview and worldview emerges as a form of reflection, i.e. self-awareness), in the form of consciousness (philosophical worldview, aesthetic worldview, legal ideology, and others), levels of consciousness (ordinary, empirical, theoretical worldview), according to the nature of understanding the course of the historical process (progressive and conservative worldview), etc. In the context of our research the difference of the worldviews according to their main historical forms, that is, the division and elucidation of the identity of the historical types of the worldview, assume the most significant importance.

We share the opinion of I. Boychenko [2] that worldview is an original systemic, but not a chaotic formation. Like any other system, it has its own structure. A system and a structure are fairly close concepts, but not identical. A structure

is a combination of elements forming one or another system, and the relationship between these elements. Therefore, a structure is sometimes defined as an inner shape of a particular system-defined object. The system-defined object covers it, but it can't be equated with it, because the structure specifies only one section of the object, while the object may have more than one section. In the first case, the object appears as a certain system, in the second – as a set of systems, and is defined by its polystructure, because each of these systems has its own structure. However, even the monosystemic object, i.e. some kind of an unconditioned system, cannot be identified with the structure.

The structure, as it has already been noted above, is only the internal form of the systemic object, the system is a concept broader than the structure, as it is characterized not only by the internal relationships between its elements, but also by the links, which appear as external with respect to a particular system and stipulate its, so to say, outward form and the peculiarities of the relations with other surrounding systems. Thus, the system can be seen in internal form(s), and in external. The systems can also be one-dimensional and multidimensional. The one-dimensional systems are monostructural, the multidimensional are polystructural, because they contain not one, but several structures. The worldview is a system of formation, which is characterized by multidimensionality. Therefore, it is possible to identify several structures according to the following main characteristics: a) the levels of one's perception of the world; b) the subsystems of the worldview; c) its semantic concepts.

Considered in this perspective, the structure of the worldview includes three subsystems: cognitive, axiological and behavioral. They all are formed simultaneously in the process of becoming of the human worldview; however, at different stages of this formation one or another subsystem plays the leading role. So, at the first stage the cognitive subsystem dominates. And it is quite clear, because in order to form his own view of the world (and especially the system of such views, i.e. outlook), the subject of worldview must first get at least some knowledge about the world. The combination of the gained human knowledge characterizes the cognitive subsystem of his worldview. But exactly the multitude of philosophical knowledge forms the cognitive subsystem.

It is necessary to distinguish between philosophical knowledge and scientific knowledge (epistemic). Scientific knowledge is characterized by objectivity. A scientist in the research process tries to grasp the object without regard to the subject, that is, in its pure form, as such, without any subjective impurities, without taking into account the desires, interests, goals, etc of the subject. It concerns the knowledge that is produced in all three spheres

of modern science: natural science, technological science and social science. In technological science, where the external creations, concerning the subject, of nature and technology are studied, the object approach is manifested particularly clearly. But that very object approach is implemented in social science as well. If in natural science and technological science the object approach is the study of the object outside the subject, in the social science the situation changes "accurately to the opposite". Here the subject is studied as such because it appears as an object.

If we are talking about the worldview knowledge, then it can't touch any object apart from the subject or the subject separately from the object. The subject of worldview knowledge (mythological, religious, and philosophical) is a relationship, a kind of a bridge between subject and object [3]. Therefore, in contrast to scientific knowledge, philosophical knowledge has not an object but subject-object nature. This is the first feature of philosophical knowledge, which distinguishes it from the scientific knowledge. The second feature means that its authentic (that is the most appropriate) way of existence is an interiorizing form of expression. Interiorization is a kind of "intrinsication" of some external objects, processes and phenomena and their characteristics, and their transformation in the internal domain of the spiritual world of man, in particular the conversion of the objectified knowledge that a person gets to his inner convictions.

In his teaching about the values set forth in particular in the work "Philosophy of life" [4], Heinrich Rickert outlined the specificity of this important component of the human experience. The values were considered by him as a universal basis for determination of the motivation of human behavior. Each worldview is based on the special system of values; however, Rickert drew attention to the generally valid characteristics of the values available in any worldview. Thus, the philosopher discovered the universal characteristics of the worldview, unlike Dilthey, who set himself the task of finding the way to find out the uniqueness of human experience, and so the revealing of the certain types of worldview served him only as a supplement. However, the knowledge of the universally valid values gives the basis for the analysis of specific historical systems on which different types of worldview are based. Figuring out the significance of values for different types of knowledge, particularly scientific, Rickert developed a methodological framework for revealing of the value substratum of education [5].

As I. Boychenko notes [2], the value subsystem of the worldview, based on the totality of interiorizing values, takes priority in the second phase of its formation. Value is a concept used to refer such objects of nature and culture (or their characteristics),

to which a person attaches particular importance. Thanks to this the mentioned above objects – natural and cultural – are considered by the person not only as some means, but above all as a goal, something self-sufficient, that has the value as such, appears as "self-value". All the values created by the mankind throughout its historical development, present quite a colorful variety of forms. One of the most important criteria by which these forms can be distinguished, is the division of the values on material and spiritual.

Material values are the objects of nature or culture, in which a special role for a person play certain subjectively fixed properties, features, characteristics, etc of a material nature. So, jewelry, property, audio visual equipment, or other material items in order to become wealth, must have certain distinct mechanical, physical, chemical and other material characteristics, properties, etc. that enable a special role of these objects in people's lives. For example, there is no doubt that a palace, a limousine or a yacht have a status of wealth. But if these things are made, for example, of sand, ice or paper, but not of the proper raw materials, they can hardly be classified as tangible assets. So, material goods are those objects of nature or culture, the special importance of which for a man is directly stipulated by their specific material characteristics.

Spiritual values have many features in common with the material values. Let us consider this at greater length. On the one hand, certain subjects, as well as the characteristics by which certain objects, phenomena and processes become values, exist objectively, outside of people's minds and independently of it; on the other hand, as such, without regard to entities (activities, behavior, consciousness, philosophy and so on), they are not values. In other words, being a value is not an inherent property of certain objects. Value is the property, which the definitely objectively existing objects or their characteristics (again, existing objectively) acquire only through the relationship with the subject entering into the everyday life activity. That is, it is acquired only through the relationship with the needs, interests and goals of the subject (for example, gold is not a value as such; it becomes such only in a society that is at its highest developmental stage that is characterized by the emergence of commodity-money relations).

At the same time there are significant differences between these two varieties of human values. Spiritual values differ from the material ones by the fact that in the value of such appear predominantly human cultural property and cannot be, at least implicitly, the objects of nature. In addition, if we are talking about spiritual values, then, in relation to their material characteristics, properties as such have no special significance to humans. They are here only as a carrier, a symbolic expression of different, ideal semantic features. Thus, the value of this or that

masterpiece has a fundamentally different nature than the value of material wealth. For example, the value of the painting is evaluated not by its canvas, size, frame or paints, but by the talent of the artist and the spiritual content that the artist puts into it, and which the picture (thanks to the abilities of the author) expresses in its unique way through the whole range of the above-listed resources.

Both material and spiritual values play an important role in the making a person's worldview. Thus, material values are particularly important as a precondition of the worldview; they create a wide range of possibilities for the formation of the varieties of the worldview. The spiritual values also play a major role in the making of the worldview, as its internal components. But in any case, the certain values can become the characteristics of the worldview only through interiorization. One should differentiate values from assessment. If the value is a defined characteristic of an object, process or phenomenon of nature or culture that exists objectively and is of particular importance in connection with the subject, then assessment is the process of providing the subject with the special values of certain characteristics of the objects, phenomena and processes of nature or culture.

The German philosopher, psychologist and psychiatrist Karl Jaspers developed a special teaching about the types of worldviews ("the Psychology of worldviews" [6]), in which he analyzed their significance for the functioning of consciousness in general and human social activity in particular. Any culture is the result of human activity with a specific type of outlook, and education in this context appears to be one of the most significant socio-cultural phenomena. K. Jaspers considers some of the major worldviews and world outlooks, detailing the research of the worldview as the life of the spirit, manifesting some existential means of human existence, analyzing marginal situation.

Values act as some planes of the life of the spirit, which has antinomic and existential character and forms a multivalued position of the spirit about reality. Thus values act not only as the necessary component of the worldview, as Rikkert believed, but as its existential basis which underlies the specific historical ideological types of deployment of the human subjectivity. K. Jaspers' work "Philosophy" became his further deepening into the topic of worldview. There the existential-communicative nature of consciousness is considered [7]. The author highlights the theme of existential communication, which he covers in the second volume of this work [8]. Thereby, the worldview receives a dynamic and inter subjective interpretation. Communication in this respect is seen as the basis for educational interaction between people, in which different types of worldview are implemented. In this context, the

worldview is not only a kind of advanced and profound existential life of subjectivity, but also the result of the communication which transforms subjectivity into inter subjectivity, or rather, makes any subjectivity as such that makes sense exactly in the form of communication between people. Any other manifestations of subjectivity are derived from communicative ones.

The main characteristic of the behavioral subsystem of the worldview is the belief to which I. Boychenko rightly points out [2]. Precondition of the worldview can be defined as the knowledge, but knowledge not in its objectified form, and even not as such that is well-learned by a man. Beliefs or views are knowledge that is already turned on the internal domain of the individual. In addition, they have become important internal motives for his actions and behaviors. And beliefs as philosophical knowledge are not pointed out only at intellectual conceptual level; they are expressed herein no less degree through the emotional, volitional and value relation of a man to the world. Besides, an important feature of the philosophical beliefs is the fact that they are not limited only by the evidence-based, proven reliable knowledge, as philosophical knowledge characterizes the relationship of man to the world as a whole.

Unlike scientific knowledge that concerns local, limited objects and that can be exhaustively evidential, philosophical knowledge characterizes the world as a whole, the boundaries of which extend along with the spiritual development of a man. That is why philosophical knowledge can never be exhausted only through the clearly proven knowledge: it always contains a point of faith. Faith is a person's ability to perceive such knowledge as certainly true that found an adequate proof neither in the logical evidence, nor in private or public practical experience of a person. Philosophical faith can be defined as the ability of a person to perceive the world as actual, desired – as true. You can consider the faith either as means of peoples' belief or as the fact in what people believe (for example, religious teachings). When it comes to philosophy, the faith in the first sense is meant.

So, the worldview belief can be defined as intellectual, emotional, value, strong-willed attitude of a man to knowledge as to the truth (or not truth) through a combination of evidence and faith. As beliefs contain the moment of faith, they always combine the reliably true knowledge with the knowledge unchecked, "taken on trust". Consequently doubt is an indispensable and important component of the behavioral subsystem of the worldview in particular and philosophy in general. Doubt is a person's hesitations between the conviction of the truth of the certain philosophical knowledge and no less the conviction of their falsity.

A newly born baby begins, in one form or another, to learn to use the philosophically worldview ideas. For the spiritual development of a person the natural coincidence of ontogenesis (individual development) and phylogenesis (tribal development) is typical. According to I. Goethe, that means that every human individual in his spiritual development in a conscious or natural form passes briefly the main stages of spiritual development of mankind. Hegel, the German philosopher, in his special work "Phenomenology of spirit" analyzed in detail the process of the human's spiritual formation by considering it in the light of reproduction of the major stages of human development. Another German scholar O. Spengler in the work "the Decline of Europe" found some features of the coincidence of the development of the individual with the main stages of the spiritual development of its civilization.

Every individual in the universal scale, as well as humanity as a whole, inevitably passes through the stage of purely spontaneous philosophical development, which can be called mythological. The most important feature of this ideological stage is complete unawareness and dependence on external forces, the perception of these forces in a converted form. For humanity such forces are the forces of nature that appear in the generalized and personified form of gods, demons, and other unusual higher virtues (regardless of their value characteristics). For the newborn human individual the first step in the formation of the worldview is natural, and the adults from his inner circle become the omnipotent forces, mythological-like beings.

On the basis of the analysis of the worldview the complex dynamics of the ideological orientations of the individual in modern society, due to the controversial nature of communication in the context of globalization, has been specified. As it was stated, there is a substantial extension of personal space at the expense of the increasing of the space of interpersonal communication (global communication). This leads to the generation of the new dimensions of human interaction with nature, to the reconsideration of his place in the world, to identification of the new aspects in the social development and opens the prospects for harmonization of the global manifestations of the spiritual culture with the traditional view of the value status of the individual, determined by his social background.

#### References

1. Dilthey, W. (2000). Introduction into sciences on spirit. Experience of establishing the grounds for studying society and history. *Collection of works : in six volumes*. Moscow : House of the intellectual book. V. 1 [in Russian].
2. Boychenko, I. V. (2000). *Philosophy of history : textbook*. Kyiv : Znannya, KOO [in Ukrainian].

3. Boychenko, I. V. (1997). *Social philosophy : concise encyclopaedical dictionary*. Kyiv, Kharkiv : VMP «Rubikon» [inUkrainian].
4. Rickert, H. (1998) Introduction into transcendental philosophy. Subject of knowledge. *Philosophy of life*. Kiev : Nika-Centre[in Russian].
5. Rickert, H. (1998) On system of values. *Sciences on nature and sciences on culture*. Moscow : Respublika[in Russian].
6. Jaspers, K. (2009). *Psychology of worldviews*. Kyiv : Universe [in Ukrainian].
7. Jaspers, K. (2012). *Philosophy*. Book one. Philosophical orienting in the world. Moscow : «Kanon+» [in Russian].
8. Jaspers, K. (2012). *Philosophy*. Book two. Enlightenment of existence. Moscow : «Kanon+» [inRussian].

**Information about the author:**

**Vorobyova Lyubov Serhiivna**

lubava\_61@mail.ru

National State Tax Service University of Ukraine,  
31 Karl Marx Street, Irpin',  
08201, Ukraine.

doi: 10.7905/vers.v1i3.806

*Received at the editors' office: 20.09.2013.*

*Accepted for publishing: 13.10.2013.*

*Translation: Nataliia Baiteriakova*

