

### VALUES OF THE STUDENT COMMUNITY (PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTUALIZATION)

*Topicality.* As for the students, we should consider two positions – one more counterfactual, another more factual. From the counterfactual perspective the students should be considered as potential members of the community of researchers and professors. On the contrary to the teaching potential that is revealed rather gradually the engaging in scientific discoveries (or their own proper scientific discoveries) is available for students from the first years of teaching. This counterfactuality is not just noticeable, but often it acts as leading motivator of students – initially they have been acquiring this status. In fact, the student is a special social group that already has certain defined and steel lines, which, however, also require its adequate interpretation. This is not just a community of young people who most of the time acquires knowledge and shares common values, similar in their spirit simultaneously to the revolutionary and entrepreneur communities. In their vast majority they are also too impressionable teenagers, both trusting and secret, honest and adventurous, organized and ready to strange behavior. What exactly will be crucial in this cocktail of motivations – critically depends on the climate of the university, the composition of the student group, especially – on whether a student could see in professors an example to follow.

Among the academic values to the students the academic honesty is one of the most admirable, because it the nearest for the scientist is – scientific truth keepers could not be cheated about it, it could not be substituted by palliative. When during the course of higher education the students should rediscover scientific truth by reproducing the steps and decisions of famous scientists-discoverers, they are also experiencing a feeling of personal discoveries, although such “discovery” is repeated thousands and millions of times by other students. For more experienced professors, scientists and researchers at the university, these “findings” is not at all real discovery, because once they had already realized the first time by a prominent scientist – indeed, it is always the very scientist aim to open some truth to mankind for the first time. However, such “discoveries” of students have for an academic life at the University great importance. Because a student who repeats the discovery in the training mode is not academically dishonest – his/her honesty is that he was able to reproduce the logic of scientific discovery by himself/herself, and not copied from his/her mates scientific work or from the Internet. In addition to purely educational goals of assimilation the thesis that already has a status of scientific norm, we always have to consider the supporting, concomitant goal of the such re-openings – after all, where thousands and millions of researchers were repeated the formulaic steps someone can identify gaps in knowledge, the filling of which may lead to a genuine new scientific discovery. From this example we can see both that in academic environment not only the science creates education, but also the educational process is constantly pushing further scientific discoveries up.

*Analysis of recent and relevant researches and publications.* Student community is extremely important object of study for modern social sciences and humanities. Even Herbert Marcuse in 1960-s years drew attention to the fact that a leading social group of modern society became the students as the most active and talented representatives of the younger generation [12]. In 1972, John Searle provided a sociological study of the student riots – with all their virtues and defects at the same time [14]. And if the social role of students as the leading social group is not in doubt, but the nature and the specifics of their value position has not been clear theoretical summing-up. Whether the issue is not properly selected means – or it should be explained by a specific difficulty associated with particular complexity of the research subject? In our opinion, the existing two reasons, however, are worth looking at each of them separately.

Can we accept the student as a social group that seeks «the hegemony» in the words of Antonio Gramsci [6]? We think – do not. If in 1960-70-s the Western countries students even claimed on such a mission, and especially in its political form, now the situation there has changed dramatically. Of course, the hegemon of modern society is not at all the proletariat, which is now largely moved to the status of the middle class in developed countries and in the Third World countries has not reached

European-style class consciousness and it is unknown whether it ever comes to it. However, the very idea of social messianism largely gone down in history – more along with the proletariat, but later also along other social groups. So, before philosophers had been trying to give this hegemonic mission to students, they gave it to the intelligentsia (Karl Mannheim [11]) and managers (Peter Drucker [5]). However, that version of the managers revolution was most developed in Western social science while students were somewhat overshadowed - at least, they has for a long time no attributes of messianism. Thus, students are unlikely to have certain features of “class” by analogy with the proletariat interests - economic, political or any other. Yet, it is - a social group which is clearly different from others, including their values. If it is not necessary to speak about certain “messianism” of students as a social group, it is specific own mission that students still have. However, in our view, it is not correct to formulate this mission in the political, economic and other outdoor to education terms, even if we talking not about the interests but the values.

In Ukrainian sociological researches we can find several attempts to understand the value of students as a social unit [16; 19; 20]. It is important to understand how the students themselves considered their values, in comparison to the scientists consideration of it – is it the same values or different? For example, it is necessary to compare the results of analysis of students' spiritual values in their assessment by experts [20] and by students [16]. The studies were conducted in virtually the same time – the end of 2012 in Lviv [15, p. 166] and in 2008-2010 in Kiev [20, p. 108]. The results were strikingly dissimilar that could not be explained by the difference between regions (rather according to stable stereotype one would expect opposite regional estimates). For example, only 16.7% of the experts in Lviv defined patriotism as the dominant value for students [16, p.170], while 56.2% of the students in Kiev considered patriotism as a characteristic of modern Ukrainian students [20, p. 110], environmental values (respectively – “lean”, “respect for nature”) were recognized by 11.1% of experts and 72.5% of the students, “national position” in the experts rating – 20%, according to the students: ‘the belief in a national idea’ – 37.9%, “national dignity” – 63.5%, “respect for national traditions” – 72.8%. And such examples of mismatch in these researches could be continued.

What is the root of the problem? It is unlikely that the reason lays in the lack of sociological accuracy that can exceed even in extreme cases 2-3%. Regional differences it is also inappropriate, because the Western Ukraine patriotism and respect for national traditions is not lower than the capital – rather much higher. Obviously, we should speak of significant differences in the estimates: on the one hand – the “experts” – the professors from secular and spiritual of universities and to the other hand – the students (in fact it was their self-esteem).

Findings from this more than self-evident assumption may, however, be different. First, you can generally ignore such results of opinion polls on values that appeal to estimates. Second, you can try to find whose assessment is more objective. Finally, thirdly, we can take into account the impact of the assessment on the future behavior of respondents.

So, whatever would be the results of opinion polls, at least unwise to ignore them – they only should be correctly interpreted. When evaluations were under exam, one should understand that they may not accurately reflect some values of other persons – the values of other obtained by refractive values, namely the own values of respondents. For example, you talk about the critical attitude of professors to students, or inflated self-esteem of students – or both that and the other at the same time. In order to decide which factor is more objectively misrepresented the situation with the student values one should refer to not questionable and pronounced manifestations of student values in their next civic behavior. Values can not be seen simply as a means of self-representation – instead values show a way of establishing their identity in action – Myroslav Popovych represents position close to this our view [18]. If we recall Euromaidan and the rise of social activity in Ukraine in late 2013 – early 2014, especially due to the Kiev and western students, in our case certainly it is deserves more confidence self-esteem of students, rather than professors evaluation. But how much? In our opinion, the very political events in Ukraine led the students to the following actions that have raised rates above their patriotism and national self-esteem than a preliminary survey showed. Patriotic students were ready to protect national values, while the professors were not prepared to such student self-sacrifice. Some researchers have noted the importance of self-

concept for professional and civic formation – in particular the future teacher [19, p. 216-217]. However, overall rating spiritual values of student by professors was significantly underestimated. One would assume that for other developments (such as harsher repressions of the Yanukovich regime of first student protests on Independence Maidan in Kiev), it could have been greater correctness in their assessments of professors. But as observed G.W.F.Hegel, “history does not know conditional mode” [7]: only actions creates available human reality, history is the result that actually occur.

So it is worth talking about serious problems with the expert community – especially with its methodology, the general approach to determining the value orientations of domestic students. There are both objective reasons in the research facility and the lack of sophistication of methodological culture medium of study (as we had already demonstrated [17]).

*The article aim* is to determine the theoretical and methodological basis for further researches of values of student community and strategic course for ethical examine of it.

*Explanation of main content.* Communicative methodology as a basis presupposes to include a communication as the subject of research of the students values and at the same time to include communication in the very procedure of such research. Clarification of student values can not be the procedure of abstract design of the imagined world of values excluded the real communication of students and with students. Such imaginary theoretical strategy would more represent what is happened in the minds of these «designer» than that of the students: then value image of the students will diverge significantly from the real values of the students. However, even such a design can not be ignored – it must be taken into account in the construction of communication between students and professors. But for adequate evaluation of this design, such as for adequately assessment of the value of self-construction of students (which is also not true in last instance), one must use the methodological tools of philosophical hermeneutics.

If one want to understand student, one should first understand professor. Because since the time of the founding of the first universities the central community in every university is professors. Sufficient is to recall the lines of university anthem Gaudeamus “Vivat Academia, Vivant professores!”, which students sing at all times: immediately after followed by the string “Vivat membrum quodlibet, Vivant membra quaelibet. Semper sint in flore. Semper sint in flore!”. Obviously, there is a direct indication that the professorship possible thanks to the prosperity of all and every member of the whole university community. Let us try to understand why professors received such respect and honor from students as well – who deserve, in fact, to be called this honorable name.

First, after Gaudeamus, we will call the professors all teaching staff in university – i.e. anyone who conducts professional training in university classrooms. This approach is typical particularly in American universities where there is no post of “assistant”, “docent”, and instead of all of them, usual for Ukrainian universities, everyone use the term “associated professor”.

Obviously, to become a professor one must have deep and very significant knowledge in some science, but only possession of this knowledge is not enough. If we turn to the analysis of the phenomenon of criticism of “university” philosophy at the nineteenth century in Germany, we could reveal the benefits and risks of university teaching, and therefore bonuses and loss of profession of the professor. Ulrich Johannes Schneider accents on the characteristics of teaching of the philosophy at German universities in nineteenth century [13]. This author notes that thinkers recognized as a great philosophers like Nietzsche and before him Arthur Schopenhauer and Eduard von Hartmann acted with sharp criticism of university philosophy [13, p. 201]. Why?

To the one hand, due to philosophy professor in Germany has become a respected official. This career achievement has its obvious advantages for philosophers – associated with a certain package of benefits (high social status) and less obvious to the public limits in the creative side of their work and even quite unpleasant for philosophers chance to receive government duty to support certain public policy. These advantages and disadvantages were not secret to the students, and they perceived it ambiguously.

First – about benefits. Schneider says: “Professionalization of university teaching and research activities, along with specialization of scientific disciplines made philosophical department one of the

largest and most important in the second half of the XIX century” [13, p. 235]. This professionalization owed not least one occasion: university education was paid for all courses and students recorded on their own – it means that the quality of teaching depended recognition of the student audience, and therefore career success of professors. Yes, the professor might be administrated by top-management (rector or local political power) – as a rule, it happened so, but then everything depended only on his teaching skills: if he failed to convince, to lead the audience – he lost the post. Philosophers as professors, in our opinion, compared with professors of other sciences have always the advantage that in addition to positive verified knowledge inherent in all science, they can also appeal to the personal interests of the students – their religious, political, aesthetic, and not least ethical values and needs.

In the second half of the nineteenth century in Germany the influence of philosophy on school teacher learning was prominent: “... the philosophy was included in teacher training, candidates for teachers' positions in the school have to pass the so-called “philosophicum” (examination in philosophy), which included, in addition to checking basic knowledge of philosophy, careful reading of the classic philosophical texts” [13, p. 242]. This worldview was reinforced not only political but also ethical mission philosophy.

But this mission was not always impeccable. There are not only intellectual temptations and seductions for philosophy. Value aberration of the universal humanism by German professors such as Martin Heidegger in Weimar republic was not the effect of restricting academic – on the contrary, it was its free result in a kind of German performance of academic values at the end of XIX – early XX century. By the way, it was very interrelated to the political process when Nazi rise to power took place as a result of a long process of democratic battles, totalitarian deviation from which only finally happened – in late 1932 – early 1933 [4; 10; 15]. This raises questions about whether there is such a self-sufficient academic values from an ethical point of view and whether they can be sufficient to determine ethical values professors. The answer, which offered Pierre Bourdieu – namely on professors' blindness on their own activities, supposedly inherent to *Homo academicus* [3] seems to us only partially acceptable and does not give the sufficient answer to the question, but only some palliative.

Obviously, we should talk not only about the belief in the truth of a certain type of knowledge and not only about a particular type of mentoring as unambiguous values important for understanding the behavior regulative of professors. Such knowledge and a mentoring can be quite specific. Sufficient to recall the example of Martin Heidegger with his inaugural speech at the substituted positions of rector of Freiburg University in early 1933, when he talks about leadership (“Fuehrerschaft”) and following (“Gefolgschaft”) in university life, especially in the relationship between professors and students, “Because crucial in leadership – not an empty advance, but the power for the ability to go alone, not for contrariness and ambition, but because of the deepest calling and broadest duty. This strength relates to the essential, creates the best selection and awakens true following of those who have new courage” [8, p. 14]. This leadership sounds like a Nietzsche's calling of superman (*Ueberschensch*) and by Heidegger it seems that a true leader in the community is to be a university professor who best knows and feels his duty to the nation and destiny, and therefore has the moral right to lead. However, service for the people by the Heidegger turns serving the state, and we know he knew what a kind of state and what the state – even at the very beginning it was obvious the “specific” of Nazis methods – deceit, violence, intolerance and arrogance. Unfortunately, these methods today are embracing some states, and thus part of the political class of this states sell their souls to the devil – and not for the aim high, like Faust, but for vulgar profit and more vulgar and ethically meager greed of power. Heidegger encourages students to join to these “values” – Heidegger who was educated person familiar with the works of Goethe, but a man who studied at the theological and philosophical departments, was at that time the first professor in Germany! Litmus paper was his attitude to academic freedom – if it is not needed as said Heidegger, it means that for him all the truth has long been known, therefore university duty is not so much to work and fight, but rather to serve the interests of the nation, and very quickly it turns so (what apparently became an unpleasant surprise for Heidegger), that really the interests of one party, but a little later that the interests of one leader, who accumulates in himself that the leadership of which Heidegger spoke so convincingly! Obviously the founder of fundamental ontology felt he erred, but to give a philosophical answer he would be able only

after ten years in his work “Nietzsche” where he crushingly criticized all “European nihilism” that led eventually to the alleged domination of Superman and exaltation with false values [9].

What is the true value for professors? That value, our deep conviction, is critical thinking. The critical thinking in education is the core that provides certainty to the academic values, the touchstone which makes impossible to degenerate patriotism into chauvinism and Nazism, is the virtue that provide the ethics in universities and higher education better than in any other social organization and better than in any other field of public life. The best and most convincing performers and real protagonists of critical thinking have always been philosophers, whose calling – to be intellectual dissidents, always to be “suspicious minds”, regardless of political, religious or any other reprisals against them personally. Philosopher as intellectual – this social role represents the best of a critical thinking – particularly so by Theodor Adorno in his book “Minima Moralia” [1], who was trying to justify the idea of extremely critical guidelines of an intellectual, because last one has to match all the way as if he were in doubt and even suspicion of falsity of everything, what he should to examine. “There should be nothing sacred, nothing that is not required to test and rationalize” – in this way one could formulate the position of Adorno’s philosopher-intellectual.

However, Adorno followed here an opinion expressed by Max Scheler when last “...makes a distinction between ethics as a usual – as Scheler calls it “living” – worldview, which is reflected in the maxims, sententiae and proverbs, and philosophy of morality, which are not directly linked with human life” [2, p. 5]. Perhaps ethics still have to be something more, namely is the theory that justifies the value system in which there is a place for maxims, for sententiae and conceptualization for many other moral and ethical phenomena, but at least in one Scheler is probably still right – philosophy tends to hold the distance to life, while ethics is embodied in life itself and actively trying to engage in life its projects. Therefore, we have from our favorable assessment of the philosopher as a medium of critical thinking to move to the discovery of life's ethical values, which are characterizing the university and embodying a critical thinking so that it does not disrupt the academic values (as it turned out to Heidegger, who not only left the post of rector, but generally for a while went out of university life), but justifies them and gives them vitality and perspective. So how could we address this challenge?

*Conclusions and recommendations for further research.* In our opinion, this answer is no need to seek too far. To master their critical thinking professors should be based on the higher need to protect the best interests of students as individuals and students as future generations. The highest value for the professor is elevating of his/her students. To judge professor's success it is worth by evaluating of the achievements of students. So, not the articles and monographs, not the scientific degrees and academic titles, not membership in academies or high administrative positions in universities is a testament to the success of the professor, but further life and career success of his/her former students. Correspondingly the higher value for students is to outmatch their professor but recognize the immeasurable academic supremacy of him or her. So counterfactual in academic values should always be the basis for factual.

### Bibliography

1. Adorno T. Minima Moralia. Reflexionen aus dem beschädigten Leben / Theodor W. Adorno. – Fr. am M.: Suhrkamp, 1990. – 394 S.
2. Adorno, Theodor W. Probleme der Moralphilosophie / Theodor W. Adorno. Hrsg. von Thomas Schröder. - 2. Aufl. – Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997.
3. Bourdieu P. Homo academicus Le sens commun / Pierre Bourdieu. – Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1984. – 302 p.
4. Broszat M. Der Staat Hitlers: Grundlegung und Entwicklung seiner inneren Verfassung / Martin Broszat. – Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2007.
5. Drucker P. The Unseen Revolution: How Pension Fund Socialism Came to America / Peter Drucker. – New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
6. Gramsci A. Quaderni del carcere / A. Gramsci; A cura di V. Gerratana. Torino: Einaudi, 1975.
7. Hegel G.W.F. Phänomenologie des Geistes / Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel // Hegel G.W.F. Gesammelte Werke, hrsg. v. d. Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akad. d. Wiss., Bd. 9, hrsg. v. W. Bonsiepen u. R. Heede †, Hamburg 1980.
8. Heidegger M. Die Selbstbehauptung der deutschen Universität / M. Heidegger. – Breisgau, 1934. – S. 5-22.
9. Heidegger M. Nietzsche II / M. Heidegger, Hgb.: Brigitte Schillbach. – Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann Verlag, 1997, VIII, 454p.

10. Langewiesche D. Nation Nationalismus Nationalstaat In Deutschland Und Europa / Dieter Langewiesche. – München: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2000.
11. Mannheim K. The Problem of the Intelligentsia, An Enquiry into its Past and Present Role / Karl Mannheim // Essays on the Sociology of Culture, ed. by Bryan S. Turner. – London, New York: Routledge, 1992. – P. 91-170.
12. Marcuse H. Eros and Civilization, A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud. Herbert Marcuse. With a New Preface by the Author / Herbert Marcuse. – Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.
13. Schneider U. J. 'The Teaching of Philosophy at German Universities in the Nineteenth Century' / U.J. Schneider // History of Universities. – Vol. 12. – Oxford, 1993. – Pp. 197-338.
14. Searle J.R. The Campus War: A Sympathetic Look At The University In Agony / John R. Searle. – New York: World Pub. Co., 1971. – 256 p.
15. Sontheimer K. Antidemokratisches Denken in der Weimarer Republik. Die politischen Ideen des deutschen Nationalismus zwischen 1918 und 1933 / Kurt Sontheimer. – München, 1962.
16. Бліхар М.П. Духовні цінності сучасної студентської молоді (за результатами експертного опитування) / М.П. Бліхар // Вісник Одеського національного університету. Соціологія і політичні науки. – 2013. – Т.18, Вип. 2 (№2). – С. 164–172.
17. Бойченко Н. М. Сучасний університет: ціннісно-етичний вимір. Монографія / Н. М. Бойченко. – К.: ПРОМІНЬ, 2015. – 296 с.
18. Моральні цінності не можна відкладати на завтра, вони потрібні вже сьогодні (інтерв'ю з академіком НАН України М.В. Поповичем) // Вісник Національної академії наук України. – 2015. – № 2. – С. 3–6.
19. Соннова М. В. Громадянські цінності в системі цінносних пріоритетів майбутнього педагога / М.В. Соннова // Вісник Луганського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. Педагогічні науки. – 2012. – № 22 (5). – С. 209–219.
20. Статінова Н. Пріоритети та цінності сучасної студентської молоді / Н. Статінова, О. Кущенко // Вісник Київського національного торговельно-економічного університету. – 2011. – № 3. – С. 107–117.

**Наталія Бойченко**

### **Цінності спільноти студентів (філософська концептуалізація)**

*З контрфактичної точки зору студентство слід розглядати як спільноту потенційних науковців та професорів. Якщо викладацький потенціал розкривається доволі поступово, то участь у наукових відкриттях (або й справжні власні наукові відкриття) доступна для студентства з перших років навчання. Це та контрфактичність, яка постає не просто відчутним, але нерідко провідним мотиватором вчинків студентства з самого початку набуття цього статусу. Фактично ж студентство являє собою особливу соціальну групу, яка вже має певні визначені і сталі риси, які, втім, також потребують своєї адекватної інтерпретації. Комунікативна методологія як базова передбачає включення комунікації як у предмет дослідження цінностей студентства, так і у саму процедуру такого дослідження. З'ясування цінностей студентства не може бути процесом відстороненого від комунікації із самими студентами абстрактного конструювання їхнього ціннісного світу, який у такому разі більше присутній у свідомості таких «конструкторів», аніж у самих студентів: ціннісний образ студентства тоді буде суттєво розходитись із цінностями самих студентів. Не статті і монографії, не наукові ступені і вчені звання, не членство у академіях чи високі адміністративні посади в університетах є свідченням успіху професора, але життєві успіхи його колишніх студентів. Відповідно, найвищою цінністю для студентів буде перевершити їхнього професора, але визнаючи безумовну його академічну перевагу. Так контрфактичність академічних цінностей завжди повинна бути основою для їхньої фактичності.*

**Ключові слова:** цінності, етичні цінності, академічні цінності, цінності студентства, цінності професури, університет, університетські спільноти.

*Надійшла до редакції 10.08.2016 р.*