PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION AS AN EDUCATION AREA RATIONALIZATION FACTOR

Petro Matvienko

Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnitsky State Pedagogical University

Annotations:

Матвієнко Петро. Філософія освіти як чинник раціоналізації освітньої галузі

Філософія освіти виконує роль «раціоналізатора» у царині освітнього знання. Вона має два складники – освітній і філософський, які перебувають у стані рефлексивних взаємин. Саме тому низку важливих для освітньої галузі проблем автор класифікує за такими категоріями: філософсько-освітні й освітньо-філософські. Націленість філософії освіти на розв'язання принаймні цих проблем надає їй цілком очевидного практичного смислу та змісту. У статті досліджуються проблеми обох груп, оскільки вони взаємопов'язані й часто мають спільне коріння, що «ховається» у своєрідному «метабазисі». Цим метабазисом щодо освіти й філософії можуть слугувати соціокультурні, локальні чи темпоральні особливості формування ситуації філософської рефлексії та процесу освіти. Усе це потребує аналізу проблем викладання філософії у вищій школі, що може допомогти в пошуках підходів до розв'язання більш загальних проблем.

Матвиенко Петр. Философия образования как фактор рационализации образовательной отрасли

Философия образования выполняет роль «рационализатора» в области образовательного знания. Она имеет две составляющие – образовательную и философскую, которые находятся в состоянии рефлексивных взаимоотношений. Ряд важных для образовательной области проблем классифицирован по категориям: філософско-образовательные и образовательно-философские проблемы. Нацеленность философии образования на решение по крайней мере этих проблем придает ей совершенно очевидный практический смысла и содержание. В статье исследуются проблемы обеих групп. Они являются взаимосвязанными и часто имеют общие корни, которые лежит в своеобразном «метабазисе». Этим метабазисом относительно образования и относительно философии могут быть социокультурные, локальные или темпоральные особенности формирования ситуации философской рефлексии и процесса образования. Все это требует анализа проблем преподавания философии в высшей школе, которая может помочь найти подходы к решению более общих проблем.

Matvienko Petro. Philosophy of education as an education area rationalization factor

Philosophy of education serves as «rationalizer» in the field of educational knowledge. It has two components – the educational and philosophical ones which are in a state of reflexive relationships. A number of important issues for the educational area is classified by categories: philosophy-educational and education-philosophical problems. Focus of the philosophy of education on the solution of these problems gives it quite obvious practical sense and content. The problems of both groups are studied in the article. They are interrelated and often have common roots which lie in a kind of "metabasis." This metabasis concerning education and philosophy can be represented by sociocultural, local or temporal peculiarities of the formation of the situation of philosophical reflection and the educational process. This requires the analysis of the problems of teaching philosophy in higher school which may help to find ways to solve more general problems.

Key words:

філософія освіти, система знань, рефлективність.

философия образования, система знаний, рефлективность.

philosophy of education, system of knowledge, reflexivity.

The creation of notion the "philosophy of education" attests about significant worldview breakthrough, which occurred at the beginning of the 20th century. The essence of it lies in the knowledge of person measurement of the world. Using the hermeneutical terminology, we can say that the world is increasingly perceived by us as "living human world" which outside the person that it recognizes and acknowledges, loses an independent meaning

With this related growth in popularity in philosophy of the existential intension, hermeneutical issues linguophilosophical research. All these directions recognize a person as an active individual of the formation of the world picture, unlike "the mirror of nature", which only reflects what which is objectively exist. Human activity not only converts the natural material resources, but also forms a new field of research and production, the subject of which is entirely a product of human consciousness. So, the world picture fundamentally is a person measurement.

At the beginning of the 20th century awareness of this person measurement on the butt of the philosophy and education turned out to be the simultaneous development of philosophical pragmatism (W. James and J. Dewey) and pragmatic methodology in education.

Pragmatism in Science in general can be defined as the rejection of claims to a final understanding of certain fundamental unchanging entity and the desire to find effective ways to solve problems. Pragmatism in pedagogic means transition from educational process according to the scheme, "a teacher is an active subject of training, apprentice – the object of learning" to self corrected process of cooperation between educator and learner. But this self correcting has a fundamental feature that contains a certain contradiction. Under conditions of maximum account of the individual characteristics of participants in the educational process, the specific situation of learning, the learning process and its results must meet accepted standards, i.e. the quality of training and education must be *not lower than* certain level. This state of affairs does not diminish, but rather enhances the role of the teacher (both individual and community education) in contemporary education.

Today the philosophy of education, as well as a general philosophy, and pedagogy, increasingly resembles a cumulative discipline, which is a conglomerate of different (sometimes not co-determine) theories, approaches and methodologies. It would seem, the modern *system of knowledge* becomes more and more complete, overlapping most of the territory that once was considered "terra incognita", with a minimum of "white spots". But while adopting such a system of knowledge increasingly more complicated. There is a kind of paradox. Humanity *in general* found answers to the most urgent issues caused by contact with reality. However, for professional mastering specific body of knowledge acquired by mankind, turns out to be too complicated. Issues that arise in the process of real activity, it is easier to resolve anew than to seek the answers among the intellectual achievements of community!

What is the way out of this situation? The most obvious to us appears to be narrowing the specialization. Specialist carefully examines a specific industry sector in all details and nuances. It becomes like a precision device is intended only for indoor operations and ineffective for all others. A clear example of such specialist is a modern scholar, say, in any natural science. To successfully carry out its work it, in addition to special competence requires up-to-date technological and informational support: instrumentation, computing facilities, databases and search engines. If a researcher has all this, it has the ability to focus only on improvement of highly specialized competence.

Somewhat in a different position is a practitioner-oriented tasks considerably broader spectrum. Practices cannot be equally *theoretically* "advanced" in all branches associated with its activities. He has to find a compromise between the optimum theoretical knowledge, accurate assimilation set of instructions and rules for performing common operations, improvisation in custom situations and using their own experiences. Personal experiences (personal knowledge) that is formed on the basis of the synthesis of primary information and acquired skills, intuition, i.e. has a rational (*explicit* knowledge) so irrational (*implicit* knowledge) components. And the accumulation of experience in such practice is primarily based on the tacit knowledge that is difficult to master for "books". Therefore, in contrast to "clean" the researcher, practitioner must each perform, in addition to the "main", while a whole range of "additional" tasks. Therefore, he could not afford the "luxury" of increasingly more perfect his *knowledge* of narrow specialization, and can only enhance your experience. This fully applies to the teachers and practitioners that need to possess not only the competence of the subject that they teach and pedagogical competences, which based not so much on theoretical as practical knowledge.

As for the pedagogical knowledge, the source of its accumulation is not only scientific research, but also all practical activities. We honor the classics of pedagogy, each of which has created an original, not similar to the other system, and the study of their scholarly legacy. The result of this study is to understand two fundamental points. *First,* each of these systems is based on a certain set of assumptions, has its own set of principles, values, goals, is holistic and some degree self-contained. Such systems may be in general not compatible between themselves (like systems A. Makarenko, V. Sukhomlynskyi or R. Steiner), but each of them successfully performs basic pedagogical task. *Secondly*, if we consider the progressive system of generalized, then you will notice that they have a lot in common at the level of principles. So, for example, mentioned the three systems common is orientation on the self organizational process of personal development, motivation, intrinsic motivation of the pupil, etc. Although implemented it due to the quite great between the approaches and techniques.

In view of the above, we can formulate one of the pressing issues that it has addressed the philosophy of education. This is the problem of overcoming the contradictions between the increase in the total accumulated within the relevant industry information (respectively, and the amount of information that you want to assimilate in the learning process) and physical abilities required for the assimilation of this information within a limited time. The obvious ways of solving this problem is or narrow specialization in learning, or obtaining certain basic knowledge and further "free diving" course of gaining own experience. Consequently, there is a contradiction, at least between the two objectives: universalism and the depth and quality of knowledge. And these differences very much.

Philosophy of education, as well as any other philosophical disciplines, today is not vying for the role of "inventor" of new knowledge. Philosophy in general is capable of forming beliefs, harmonize the ideological system, to think critically, that is, speaking to James, teaches to see alternatives. Therefore, the philosophy in the intangible realm quite successfully performs the role of rationalizer of the activity of which is not less important than activities "of the inventor". That is why, as in Andrushchenko [1, p. 23], philosophy of education, being by inter-subject industry knowledge, uses approaches and knowledge of all reflexive subjects: methodology, axiology, history, culture, its own philosophy. Everything is borrowed from other disciplines, philosophy of education uses to create the model for overcoming the crisis in education, to solve the most common problems of pedagogical

activity, designing ways of building a new pedagogical science.

Philosophical-educational and educational-philosophical problems

In the philosophy of education logically select two components – education and philosophy, which are characterized by a reflexive relationship. But as each of these two industries has its own specifics, then focusing on philosophy of education can highlight problems with the primary philosophical and primary education factor. Therefore, these problems should have been divided into two groups: "philosophical-educational and educational-philosophical" – regardless of whether they have philosophical or educational roots, and therefore associated primarily with philosophical or educational discourse. However, the problems of both groups are interlinked and often have common roots that "hiding" in the so called "metabasis". This metabasis concerning education and philosophy can serve as socio-cultural, local and temporal features of the situation of philosophical reflection and the process of education. All of this requires analysis of the problems in the teaching of philosophy in higher education that can help in finding approaches to solve the more common problems, identifying them as "philosophical-educational" and "educational philosophy".

Philosophical and educational problems

The key for them is internally philosophical concentration, i.e. oriented philosophy on self-knowledge and cognitive self-replication. This is an important factor, actually is a precondition for institutional development philosophy as a separate field of activity. The thing is that this level is based not only on specific philosophical discourse, but also on understanding the relationship of this discipline with other tangent lines, primarily with the components of the educational sector. Schematically it can be classified as follows:

1) ***Problem of auto-reflection***, which, on conviction of a Russian researcher V. Kuznetsov, is based on"screaming discrepancy between universally common philosophical education and almost completely absent reflexive understanding is adjusted to its specific" [2]. This philosophy is usually understood as auto-reflection, scrutiny to self-description and reason of their own considerations. Of all the subjects in a similar position to a certain extent is probably only pedagogy: teaching pedagogy cannot implement the performative way which is shown by the same pedagogy relationships and dependencies [2].

2) ***the problem of self-determination*** philosophy is contributed by the modern State of proliferation of philosophical approaches and concepts. Philosophical thought survives splitting of powerful philosophical systems and peaceful and tolerant coexistence of numerous independent "copyright" concepts. Because of this, various philosophical approaches unequally define its aims and tasks (for example, given the theoretical or methodological priorities).

3) ***the problem of the definition of*** the objective field of teaching of philosophy, which is tangent to the previous. History of philosophy, or, actually, a philosophizing? This problem actually arises from significant branching of modern philosophy, which cannot be considered as a separate academic discipline outside the general context of the study that is covered in the course of special disciplines. In addition, you cannot summarize the study of philosophy to the assimilation of the wise men of the past without projection on the problems of the present.

Educational and philosophical problems

This group is practically oriented, therefore covers more aspects of the intersection of philosophy from the context of its application. Among them:

1) ***the problem of the effectiveness of the teaching of philosophy*** and philosophical disciplines to students of not philosophical specialties. Today in Ukraine it can be divided into individual segments:

– the importance of teaching philosophy and its significance is not fully appreciated on all levels of the structure of the educational system – from the student's link to the governing structures of universities and curriculum developers;

– the structure of the course of philosophy is to be studied for the representatives of the contingent of students (first courses), where she is taught through the study of this discipline, fundamentally different (at the level of abstraction) of General and specialized, turns out to be too weak.

2) ***the problem of motivation to study philosophy***. It has existential and epistemological character and is associated with a certain level of resistance on cognition and learning material of the philosophical disciplines, one may say, at the level of mindset. For people of older age, not philosophers, who studied philosophy in "dialectical materialism-historical materialism" version, it still bears the stamp of intellectual censorship, is inextricably linked with the official ideology. But in those days at least politically motivated external necessity of studying philosophy existed. For the present the same generations of students actually have no rational motivations for studying philosophy, except for the fact of the presence of philosophical courses in academic terms, moreover, there is considerable aloof of these courses from basic and core subjects, the study of which, actually, is the aim of learning in universities.

3) ***the problem of compliance of philosophical courses to requirements of present day***. It is caused by the fact that due to the mentioned features

of the domestic situation of philosophy, students- not philosophers often are not read the material from the modern world philosophy, which can attract the attention of its actuality. Moreover, there is no attention and explanation of the material on the philosophy of the 20th century. The emphasis is on philosophical classics, but, as a rule, in the context of the narrow ratio of epistemological and ontological foundations.

4) *the problem of understanding the teacher – student* is closely linked with the problem of motivation to study philosophy. There is often a situation when members of the philosophical disciplines, even tangentially, are not acquainted with the material base and core subjects. K. Ushinskyi implicated on the inadmissibility of such State, emphasizing on the fact that "one-sided philologist still less capable to be a good tutor, than the lopsided physiologist, historian" [3, p. 26]. The following quote describes what base of education must not be abstract, and specifically oriented, and in this sense philosophers and philologists are the representatives of the most abstract branch of knowledge, unlike concrete. But among teachers of philosophy (as well as socio-humanitarian disciplines in General), unfortunately, there are those who do not possess philosophical methods and are limited in teaching mechanical broadcasting information obtained from textbooks. The latter is an additional barrier between students and teachers and that makes problematic the need to study subjects that are taught.

5) *the problem of teacher's personality of philosophy,* which is attached even in greater degree of a person probation than the previous one. The teacher should have wide own horizons, to be sociable, to demonstrate in practice benefit from mastering of this discipline.

Note: all of the above, there is not isolated, and against the background of factors that characterize the proper education and philosophy as institutionally separate industry. Identified problems are common to many countries and depend on different factors, deterministic features time and socio-economic context.

Consequently, the main problem of education can be called the conservation and partial conformity of enclosure filling of the educational process with the realities of the present. Although education is focused on providing of "persistent truths" to the student, the reality of daily proves their relativity and realizes the aims of education. Therefore, this problem can be formulated as the problem of discrepancies between education and the reality that is similar to the problem of discrepancies between theory and practice. The special problem of philosophy on this background can be recognized the exclusion of this area of knowledge from practical problems and challenges and overwhelming concentration on internal reflection, which is hidden

behind the purpose of cognition in General truths and principles. That is why many valuable developments in philosophy that are associated exclusively with this industry of knowledge that is considered to be abstract, are unsolicited. The problem is partially solved within projects of practical interdisciplinary research, such as neo-pragmatism, communicative philosophy (J. Habermas, K.-O. Apel, V. Hosle), philosophy of education, philosophy of technology, etc. One of the ways to solve the problems of both areas – philosophy and education – which, as we see, are in the reflexive relationship, is a process of deepening and expansion of their interaction. This education has the ability to overcome the problem of its conservatism and philosophy gets a powerful impulse for its development.

References

1. *Philosophy of education : study guide* (2009). (Andrushchenko, V. andPredbors'ka, I., Ed.). Kyiv : M.P. Drahomanov National Pedagogical University Press [in Ukrainian].
2. Kuznetsov, V. Yu. (2003). Philosophy of teaching philosophy. *Reporter of Moscow University,* 5, 73—85 [in Russian].
3. Ushinsky, K. D. (1946). Man as a subject of bringing up : Experience of pedagogical anthropology. *Selected works,* Book.1. Moscow : APS USSR Press [in Russian].

Information about the author:
Matvienko Petro Volodymyrovych
mpetro@ukr.net
Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnitsky
State Pedagogical University,
20 Lenin Street, Melitopol,
72312, Ukraine.

Translation: Halyna Matiukha