

Ушаков Артем Сергійович – кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри іноземної філології та практики перекладу Київського національного університету культури і мистецтв (м. Київ, Україна).
E-mail: artem.s.usakov@gmail.com

UDC 37.04:140

PEDAGOGICAL CONCEPTION OF HUMAN AS A NEW PHILOSOPHY OF PEDAGOGICAL ACTIVITIES OF A MODERN EDUCATOR

O. I. Vyhovska

The readers are suggested the concept of “human”, in which the central position belongs not to “personality” but to human per se. Such approach is not set for the Ukrainian pedagogical science and practice yet.

In the article the author gives a formula which in fact defines structural components of the concept of “human”, their place and role.

On the basis of the author’s own investigations it is justified that this Conception is needed by teachers and it is going to be introduced into educational process, and that will lead to radical changes in school practice.

Nowadays it is of great importance to understand what skills a student should gain in order to be successful and self-sufficient. Hence, a teacher foresees the things that depend on his/her activities and knows what should be observed in a child.

Keywords: *Concept of “human”, structure of the concept, individuality, pedagogical conception of human, changes predicted in pedagogical practice.*

The conception of human is a central one in pedagogical science and practice. It is the same for development of a society which is gaining the orientation focused on human: on the one hand, under such circumstances the individual development of human is the main proof of progress, on the other hand, it is the main pre-condition of further society development. Therefore, the realization of the principle of a child-centered education and

upbringing appears to be very urgent as reflection of human-centered tendency in the development of modern civilized world.

On the philosophical level, the most significant feature of the new educational goal is a humanist trend. The modern understanding of humanist values of education is centered on the following idea: human is not a means, he is the goal. The teacher’s work will definitely correspond to up-to-date requirements if the definition of “human” is scientifically explained and, first of all, if it coincides with human nature – with sense and calling.

In the context of investigating conception of “human” it is needed to pay attention to some negative tendencies of modern school education characterized by O. V. Savchenko: particularly general deterioration of health of schoolchildren, eclectic approach to methodological principles of education, lack of tentative educational program for children of different age, poor psychological support of pedagogical process, insufficient analysis and forecast of the development of pedagogical phenomena by science. The poly-semantic interpretation of the concept of “human” is rather important in the list of reasons mentioned above. It is obvious that to support the development of every child, a teacher has definitely to work using not general methods but individual ones. In this case a pedagogical conception of human, which is the subject of the article, will be useful.

It is very important for us to find out in what way a teacher should work to develop a pupils the best in the process of their activity, how a teacher should work not to wound a unique nature of the individual, the individuality of a pupil.

Thus, **the problem is to ground the objective laws of the whole development of human, who is in the process of developing, that is a child, the principles among which a scientifically grounded pedagogical conception of human takes the main place.** We do first steps in this direction.

How intricate the task is can be judged by evaluating the level of scientific elaboration necessary for solving the problem as well as of any efforts to investigate it. This assessment was carried out by the well-known Russian scientist the director of the Institute of Human V. P. Zinchenko: “To find out the objective laws of the whole development of the individual, the personality of a pupil as a synthesis of new forms of biological (physical), spiritual, psychological and social development is still inaccessible goal for modern science about human, including pedagogical and psychological sciences.” [12] I think the quotation from his book of the president of the NAPS, Ukraine, V. G. Kremen will be in favour of the urgency of the

conception given in the title: “We have to break the chain of disrespect to personality by changing the paradigm of treating human in the society. Without no doubt, a teacher must be ready to accept his modern social task – to educate a human, who are efficient in national and global democratic space... First of all, we should refuse to consider the development of a pupil mainly as intellectual one, while the process unnoticed of social and moral formation of a child.” [15, p.108]

We have definitely to accept that the process of the development of a child is both a scientific issue (because it needs a changed paradigm of human, and, hence first of all, its principles), and a practical one, because a teacher is thought not to be ready for his new role – education of human.

The desire to make school education adequate for new social requirements makes urgent the problem of incompatibility of fundamental laws of the development of human with scientific pedagogical principles of school and pedagogical education, hence pedagogical activity. This inevitably leads to the revision of the established ideas of “education”, “creating psyche”, “formation of psychics”, spirituality, upbringing, development. Moreover, for the latter the conception of human is basic.

While solving the problem, first of all, we deal with the fact that the concept of human has not been completely elaborated. The theoretical analysis held by us [1, 7, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 29] about the ideas of the concept of “human” in different schools has proved that in psycho-pedagogical literature together with the concept of “human” (or instead of it) the concepts of “personality”, “individual”, “individuality” appear most frequently. We need to clear up the question what aspects in a teacher activity must become the main ones and which one aspect or all of them the teacher should be concentrated on.

Psychological studies about personality and individuality are thoroughly given in scientific works of such Ukrainian scientists as I. Ziaziun, N. Nychkalo, O. Savchenko, V. Semychenko, O. Sukhomlynska, for whom it became the basis for introducing the education which is focused on a person, the main idea of which is self-development, self-actualization of a person [13, p. 74–79; 18, p. 47–57; 27, 4; 25, 26]. Scientists consider that the most important value of education is not only a child, but also a teacher who is able to develop the skills and talents of a child, realize his social protection, save their individuality. Therefore, O. Savchenko thinks that management of education and development of every pupil should become a reference point for teacher’s work. Nobody could deny the thesis: you should know the nature of a person to manage well. Moreover, the latter is in favor of urgency of establishing the pedagogical conception of human.

In author’s opinion, the further analysis of well-known approaches in psychology as for solving the problem of correlation of development and education will help to understand the main point.

The comparative analysis of psychological theories of child’s development, which we analyzed in [7, p. 63–65, 8, 17, p. 3–14, 19] gives us an opportunity in the context of the author’s conception to confirm the following:

1. Psychological development has its sources and its motive powers, which do not depend on special education;
2. Well-organized education is focused on new opportunities of a child, and is not adapted to evaluable level, therefore, it leads to the development;
3. Important and specific form for psychological human development is learning the common to all mankind experience which happens in the process of education.

The latter suggests another very important and urgent task-establishing a new model of the educational process, in which a new experience is not only being learned, but is also created according to research of its role in the development of a contemporary child (as well as a teacher). I am convinced that particularly in this field of studying some new pleasant surprises or even discoveries are waiting for researchers.

More and more Russian scientists have some doubts as to sufficiency of the conception of “personality” for solving contemporary educational problems, hence, to that halo by which person-focused education is surrounded. [5, 8, 14, p. 117–118; 31]

It is important to bear in mind that our pedagogical science directs school practice towards the introduction of person-focused approach as an efficient mean of reforming Ukrainian education.

The author of the article supports B. Bratus’s [6, p. 9] point of view that “personality” is not more than a tool, though she emphasizes that Russian researchers take more drastic position: they transferred the theoretical fact directly into educational practice of “substitution human for personality, an effort of proving the grounds of human life from itself without appropriate pedagogical comprehension of the personality sense conception, as well as a goal of its use in upbringing practice. This is a strong argument in favor of necessity to conduct an independent pedagogical research of establishing a new conception of “human”.

The concept of “human”, according to L. S. Vygotskyi, is not sufficiently definite and precise scientific term. Unfortunately, it still remains

the same. We tend to equate a child's personality and his cultural development. It (personality – O. V.) is not innate, but appears to be as a result of cultural development. [11, p. 315]

Formation of the individual is a prerequisite for man's mastery of the processes of their own behaviour. That is why the development of this or that function is derived from the development of personality in general and is due to it. [11, p. 316]

For the development of our concept, findings of the fundamental researches of the founder of the Psychological Institute at Moscow University (1914) and the journal "Psychological Review" – Chelpanov Georgii Ivanovych, philosopher, psychologist, which with the same right can be considered a Ukrainian scientist, as well as Russian, – are also important. G. I. Chelpanov focuses our attention on the fact that a person always has consciousness, that he, his personality is the cause of any action. "Under it, – writes G. I. Chelpanov, – we understand the person, taken as a whole, which means that we consider both his inclination, and his propensity to feel in a certain way."

Here you can read how exactly G.I. Chelpanov explains us what the inclination is: "inclination" refers to "propensity", which is a predisposition for the feelings that are generated due to habits. There may be tendencies to some activities, games, sports, etc. Tendencies are the results not only of habits, but of organic conditions, i.e. "in the body there are such conditions in which we can have a tendency or disposition to feel or act in a certain manner. These conditions are characterized by the body itself, they are innate." [30, p. 188]

The author further states that a person has consciousness, that when he commits an act, his "I" is the course of these acts. [30, p. 194]

A comparison of the two statements of the author regarding the causes of human actions gives grounds to talk about the semantic equality of two determinations, the consequence of which is the semantic relationship of concepts: the "I" and "personality". Having recognized this, we will be able to attribute the clarification of the "I" to the latter, expressed by the author that our spiritual "I" is something far greater than the sum of mental states (a set of ideas, feelings, desires). [30, p. 199]

Let us make preceding conclusions as for the question what has cleared up the conducted analysis of different scientific approaches connected with the explanation the concept of "human". First of all, this is the fact that individual as a concept is not equal to the concept of "human", personality remains to be an end in itself the same as in the process of self-development,

as well as in upbringing and educational systems, whereas individuality is only one of the items of human personality. In connection with this it is necessary to understand that "individual approach is only an aspect of more general personal approach to a pupil..., as it is limited by considering individual peculiarities of thinking, will, memory, pupil's feelings..." [19, p. 193].

Let us lay stress on the fact that though S. Rubinshtein advised some researchers to pay attention to the thing that "something that is natural in human, the connection with natural in the world mustn't be neglected, but be understood." [24, p. 347] It is necessary to confirm that such comprehension didn't occur fully. It is missing also in teacher's pedagogical activity.

The conception of human suggested by V. Okon impresses the author most of all. The Polish scientist V. Okon writes that "the psyche appeared on the roads which was not noticed by most of the teachers. The most important is understanding by modern psyche the connection between the intellectual development of human and his morality." [20, p. 204] The fundamental research of intellectual activity of human by Russian scientist D. Bohoiavlenska is precisely devoted to revealing this connection [3].

The author's pedagogical conception of human: a distinctive feature and the essence

A theoretical analysis of statements from different scientific schools conducted by us allows to express our idea according to which human originally (starting from the birth) is individuality; every baby while showing his activity is not like another – it is individuality. Maturation of a child comes first before education under such circumstances – human is developing during the whole life together with their individuality independently from education, as well as in conscious period – exactly in the educational process, if it is developmental and purposeful, which depends directly on the circumstances that are created in the school body and in educational and upbringing process.

It can be stated that from the moment human shows their first personal features (we would say, for example, it can be any behavior pattern which is constantly repeating) and also from the time a human is involved in self-creation, this human has inherent personality, which we consider to be a tool for searching human's main point (the answer to the eternal question "What am I?") and it will exist to the moment humans achieve their top goal in themselves. We should admit that theories of mental development of a child, we mentioned above, and which are little used in the pedagogical practice,

will promote and help the scientific understanding of peculiarities of this stage in the development of a human.

There is an essential difference between the conceptions of “individuality” and “personality” – the latter isn’t innate, hence its quality of direction depends, first of all, on the process of educational development.

It obviously comes from our analysis that “natural in human” is exactly characterized by those specific features that make up the essence of individuality, it gives us the right to accept a new-born person as a personality – nowadays most of scientists are inclined to the idea that individuality is obtained simultaneously with the formation of personality, being its aspect.

According to this understanding education is in charge of child’s formation and development but according to our idea a child from the birth has individuality, and that is why its appearing doesn’t depend on education, it becomes the basis for creation of nature –consonant conditions in the process of education. The defined place of “individuality” in the structure of human is important for a teacher – they take into consideration individual specific features of a child, promote their development, creating appropriate nature-consonant conditions. From the moment a child overcame themselves, brought up their personality in themselves, both a child and a teacher take care of their individuality. Therefore, according to our understanding the formula that binds all three conceptions, which were analyzed by us, will look like this: human (individual + individuality) is born, then they become personality, human who is at the top is achieved. The scheme of this formula is like this: **Human = (individual + individuality) + personality + individuality = Human top.** This formula means in practice structural components of a concept “human”, their place and role. Let us answer the question, what will change in pedagogical process if we’ll begin to use this formula?

First of all, the essential acceptance of a little human-individuality must be obviously stated, who we cannot help taking into consideration. Moreover, the other position of a teacher as well as the representatives, who evaluate their activity, is originally attached, – the acknowledgement of individuality in a child from the moment of birth. Such position obliges much to all people who are engaged in the process of a child’s development and first of all, it concerns the teachers who are the partners, collaborators of the whole educational and upbringing process.

The evaluation of the results of pedagogical work is now relative, because it depends on individual peculiarities of pupils, the individual resources of a teacher.

Teachers should learn to work with this idea: nature-consonant activity must be a triumph in Ukrainian school; nowadays it is still often declared so long as the goal and the main result of the school and a teacher today is the formation of pupil’s personality in the educational process, and individuality is only an aspect, and there is nothing to add.

A human baby is born Human, who from the birth have their individuality. Inner human powers become stronger in the process of life, they try to accept life and themselves creatively, they try to change everything according to their own scenario – the formation of personality takes place in human, who in fact is a tool of obtaining by human some essential human things in themselves to achieve their top. We think that exactly the same idea was suggested by M. Pyrohov, who said: “give inward human... time and means to conquer outward human in themselves, ... and you will have people and citizens.” [21]. The author’s position can be finished by Paracels’s quotation: “Only the top of human is Human”, which we also fully support.

Preceding from our understanding of human, their purpose and formation, let us rephrase the Iliencko’s phrase well-known in pedagogical circles: “Individual is born, then they become a personality, individuality is defended” [2] and express our opinion as for this statement with the thesis: “Human-individuality is born who is defended himself during the life.

Table 1

Scheme of conception of human

Human at the moment of birth	Human development in the process of education and upbringing	Human at the moment of top achievement
individual+individuality	We take into consideration: individual+individuality We develop: personality+individuality	Human-top

Human become personality themselves and with the help of this personality they defend their own individuality and in this way they achieve the top in themselves, that is Human.” Shortly it can be expressed like this: “Human-individuality is born. Personality is obtained. Individuality is defended.

Human-top is achieved.” In this quotation there is the quintessence of the author conception of human, the sense of school program of child’s development and the main reference points for pedagogical activity. It can be shown by the following scheme:

Why did this conception encourage us to revise the famous Ilienکو’s phrase? In our opinion its laconic style appeals to both scientists and teachers on the one hand, and on the other hand, the priorities as for the concepts, which are the subject of the article, prevent from understanding the tasks of modern upbringing practice and stop the process of the human formation because of its incompatibility to its basis.

It should be emphasized that there is a cardinal difference of our understanding of pedagogical activity from existing points of view in Ukrainian as well as in Russian science. The author is a supporter of the “personality” concept definition by Russian scientists who don’t consider personality as the final goal being as the sense of human, but only as a tool of their formation, but she doesn’t agree with their objections of role of this concept in educational pedagogical practice. Hence, the author considers “personality to be a tool of the formation of everything that is human in everybody – adult or child – up to their own top. Undoubtedly, in this context the conception of “human” is a mega conception, which in the educational area is shown through the conception of “personality”.

For the pedagogical practice the structure of the concept of “human” is especially important. It was shown distinctively by the author’s formula, in which the central position is not in favor of “personality”, but it supports human in its sense. The teacher’s work according to this formula is based on the features of individual and individuality of a child. Nature-consonant conditions are created for further development of these features, the conditions for understanding yourself as a human are also created. In the mentioned context the pedagogical activity should be really directed exactly towards the personality as a child and at this point the author supports the approach which was chosen by Ukrainian science – the person centered approach of pedagogical practice. The author doesn’t support the radical point of view of Russian scientist and researchers who object the latter. The introduction of the mentioned conception of “human” into school practice requires the realization of another important direction. This is the teacher’s readiness to the whole vision of a child, and their readiness, teaching the specific subject, providing the systematic development of a child, the systematic vision of the world, their readiness fundamentally to combine educational and upbringing process. “... We have to forget the time when we

divided the sphere of education and upbringing. It is an indivisible activity concerning favoring the formation of personality,” as it is suggested by the president of the NAPS V. Kremen [15, p.110].

These principles are exactly realized in the context of the suggested conception of human. Therefore, to be more convinced the following is to be done:

1. **To show** under which circumstances educational and upbringing process will become the means of human development of a child, and the activity of a teacher will be nature-consonant which will supply with an individual trajectory of their own development.

2. **To introduce** the author conception to readers and to show the possibilities which this conception can give to teachers if they have the possibility to master it.

The level of importance of the tasks can be traced in the summery given by academician V. Bondar in his monograph: “All didactic conceptions which are directed to the fulfilling the state’s order appeared to be incapable to satisfy the requirements for a child’s natural free development.” [4, 12] The same things concern some other conceptions. We will try to show “how” and “what to do” to achieve this. Bearing in mind the right observation given by O. Savchenko: “There is no lack of conceptions. We lack specific suggestions how to do this!” We want to show by the example of specific student body real results of a teacher’s pedagogical activity, who works with the class but didn’t master the suggested pedagogical conception and also the hypothetical results which they can obtain in nature-consonant pedagogical activity, which was worked according to the mentioned pedagogical conception of human.

In accordance with data which we collected with the help of invented system-point method [9, 10, 11] in the secondary school in the real 7-B form, half of the pupils are the representatives of strong (quick) type of higher nervous activity and the rest are the representatives of weak (slow) type. The latter, who have the mentioned individual activity, are 14 students in the form. It is significant that at the teachers’ consultation the teachers, who work with this class, refer the children with the slow type of reaction to weak and very weak students (in their opinion, there are 6 and 9 such students).

The fact that teachers identify the type of human individuality in a child with the child’s quality shows their total misunderstanding of human nature, consequently, teachers themselves cannot create appropriate conditions for all children without exception for their whole person development. I think that the consequences are known for everybody. In my

opinion, some didactic-genetic diseases of children, which increase every year, can refer to these consequences too.

So then, we should acknowledge the relevance of these findings from studies conducted in the previous centuries, which, unfortunately, have not been mastered by Ukrainian teachers.

G. I. Chelpanov's thought of heredity of mental abilities, which is the basis of his theory of temperaments, is important for the understanding of child's characteristics. As the author rightly observes, there is a huge difference between people with respect to both their mental and physical characteristics. One carefully considers the forthcoming event; the other reflects a lot, but cannot decide to act; the third acts without any discussion. One has a strong will, the other shows his weakness; one has a different sensitivity, the other doesn't have it. In short, people are different with respect to their abilities to act and feel.

Those mental characteristics, by virtue of which a particular individual is inclined to act or feel, are called "temperament". G. I. Chelpanov divides temperaments into 4 classes: sanguine, melancholic, phlegmatic, choleric [30, p. 201], he accompanies them with a characteristic [30, p. 202], that belongs to the German physiologist J. Muller, which the author borrowed from the book by K. D. Ushynskiy [28, p. 335]. Of course, all the teachers without any exception should be guided by this knowledge about the differences of their students in their own teaching practices. It is very important for every teacher to know them as "Our Father..." and then there would not be the situation like in the 7-B form, described above.

Let us put a question: "If a teacher knew well the conception of human, suggested in this article, would they act in the same way as now?" I am sure they wouldn't! A teacher would know the role of natural individual features of a child, they would know about all features and take all these points into consideration in their pedagogical activity. The rule "do no harm" concerns "individuality" as a component of the concept "human".

Therefore, the analysis of the received experimental results grounds the necessity of mastering the conception of "human" by every teacher. This conception is a methodological reference point in teacher's pedagogical activity which under the mentioned condition obtains the ability to be nature-consonant. Then a teacher's activity is focused on structural components of human as a concept, particularly: individual, individuality, personality. A teacher is able to teach the pupils to consciously create compensatory styles of their studying activity. Moreover, a teacher themselves can obtain such kind of ability as for their own pedagogical activity. The main task of a

teacher, their professional duty, by the way, is that a teacher must take personal responsibility for it, to help children to do it in proper time till they believe in themselves, in the beauty of human nature, in divine justice of existing individual variety.

Our teacher doesn't only know "what?", "how?", but also – "why do we need to act in this way?", what possible consequences of such activity could we have and how to prevent any undesirable result.

The teacher obviously knows what available factors of human development should be applied to create in children their personality and how the revealed and clear individual features of children can be used by them for the formation of their style of life.

In such way a teacher is able to use not only external, but internal levers in their pedagogical activity because the latter is not made up into one's mind but are fundamental both for the pupils in the lesson and the teachers who are working it out. And this is the highest theoretical level of such kind of readiness, which contemporary teachers lack today! Will you agree with the idea that only the Master of pedagogical work can do this!

Using the results of experimental research conducted on the basis of a system-point method, we were able to visibly show the indispensable role of author's pedagogical conception for realizing nature-consonant activity. That means:

On condition that the author conception of human is the basis for pedagogical activity, a teacher first of all, pays attention to those individual features of a child which they must take for granted; secondly, a teacher is able not only to pay more attention to strengthening personal features in children, but to know exactly what skills should a pupil gain to be original and self-sufficient. Hence, a teacher foresee the things that depend on his activity and knows what should be observed in a child – that is, what depends in child from nature as such. A teacher is aware of (now a teacher only works more intuitively than consciously!) the results, efforts, which a teacher must have; and a teacher knows for sure what they can do and what they cannot. This kind of activity we consider to be nature-consonant to pupils, and a teacher themselves who are able to do it – professional, Master!

Under such circumstances, the best condition for reaching such level of successful breeding and development of each pupil will be created. This level corresponds to their real opportunities of educational development as well as human development within the limits of the area of actual and neighboring development. Theories of L. S. Vygotskiy are no longer formal for educators, and become real means of a teacher-master now.

In conclusion, the change of accents in interpreting the concept of “human”, working out the pedagogical conception of human as methodological reference point for new activity that is nature-consonant one for a contemporary teacher, and applying it into school educational and upbringing process will cause drastic changes in pedagogical practice.

References

- Anan'ev B. G. Chelovek kak predmet poznaniya [Person as a subject of cognition] / B. G. Anan'ev // Izbr. psikhol. tr.: v 2 t. [Selected psychological works in 2 volumes] – M.: Pedagogika, 1980. – Vol.1. – 232 p. – P. 3.
- Asmolov A. G. Lichnost' kak predmet psikhologicheskogo issledovaniya [Person as a subject of pedagogical research] / A. G. Asmolov. – M.: Izd. MGU, 1984. – 104 p.
- Bogoyavlenskaya D. B. Puti k tvorchestvu [Ways towards creation] / D. B. Bogoyavlenskaya. – Moscow: Znanie, 1981. – 96 p.
- Bondar V. I. Didaktika [Didactics] / V. I. Bondar. – Kyiv, Libid', 2005. – 264 p.
- Borytko N. M. V prostranstve vospitatel'noy deyatelnosti: monografiya [In the sphere of educational activity: monography] / N. M. Borytko; ed. N. K. Sergeev. – Volgograd: Peremena, 2001. – 181 p.
- Bratus' B. Anomaliu lichnosti [Anomaly of a person] / B. Bratus'. – Moscow, 1988. – 301 p. – P. 9.
- Vikova ta pedahohichna psikhohiia: navch. posib. [Age and pedagogical psychology: reference book] / O. V. Skrypchenko et al. – Kyiv: Prosvita, 2001. – 416 p. – P. 63-65.
- Vyhovs'ka O. Avtors'ka kontsepsiya lyudyny ta osobystisno oriyentovane navchannya: naukovе obgruntuvannya semantichnykh zmin [Author conception of human and person centered education: scientific grounds of semantic changes] / O. Vyhovs'ka // Dyrektor shkoly, litseyu, himnaziyi. – 2005. – # 5-6. – P. 41–47.
- Vyhovs'ka O. Tvorchya pedahohichna diyal'nist' yak osobystisno oriyentovana: avtors'ka kontsepsiya, tekhnolohiya [Creative pedagogical activity as a person centered one: author conception, technology] / O. Vyhovs'ka // Dyrektor shkoly, litseyu, himnaziyi. – 2002. – # 4. – P. 70–76.
- Vyhovs'ka O. I. et al. “Tochka opory” u peda-hohichniy diyal'nosti [“Foothold” in pedagogical activity] / O. I. Vyhovs'ka // Ridna shkola. –1991. – # 12. – P. 41–48.
- Vygotskiy L. S. Sobranie sochineniy: v 6 t. [Collected Works in 6 vol.] / Editor-in chief A. V. Zaporozhets. – Moscow: Pedagogika, 1982-1984. Vol. 3: Problemy razvitiya psikhiki / Ed. A. M. Matyushkin. – 1983. – 369 p.
- Zinchenko V. Chelovekoznanie: teoriya, istoriya, metod [Knowledge of person: theory, history, method] / V. Zinchenko // Chelovek. – 1990. – # 2. – P. 7.
- Zyazyun I. A. Try kyty novoyi filosofiyi osvity: humanizatsiya, individualizatsiya, intehratsiya [Three whales of new philosophy in education:

- humanization, personalization, integration] / I. A. Zyazyun //Dyrektor shkoly, litseyu, himnaziyi. – 2000. – # 1. – P. 74–79.
- Kolesnikova I. A. Pedagogicheskaya real'nost' v zerkale mezhpardigmal'noy refleksi [Pedagogical reality in the mirror of inter –paradigm reflection] / I. A. Kolesnikova. – SPb., 1999. – 242 p. – P. 117–118.
 - Kremen' V. H. Osvita i nauka v Ukraini – innovatsiyni aspekty. Stratehiya. Realizatsiya. Rezul'taty [Education and science in Ukraine – innovative aspects. Strategy. Realization. Results] / V. H. Kremen'. – Kyiv: Hramota, 2005. – 448 p.
 - Leont'ev A. N. Deyatel'nost'. Soznanie. Lichnost' [Activity. Consciousness. Personality] / A. N. Leont'ev // Izbr. psikhol. proizvedeniya [Selected psychological papers]. – Moscow: Pedagogika, 1993. – Vol. 2. –P.195–196.
 - Maksymenko S. D. Osobystist': problema struktury (henetychnyy aspekt) [Personality: the problem of structure(genetics aspect) Vital problems of contemporary Ukrainian psychology] / S. D. Maksymenko // Aktual'ni problemy suchasnoyi ukrayins'koyi psikhohiyyi. – Kyiv: Nora-Druk, 2003. – Issue 23. – 436 p. – P. 3–14.
 - Nychkalo N. H. Filosofiya suchasnoyi osvity [Philosophy of contemporary education] / N. H. Nychkalo // Pedahohika i psikhohiia. – 1996. – # 4. – P. 49–57.
 - Obshchaya psikhologiya: ycheb. dlya studentov ped. in-tov. [General psychology: Student book for Pedagogical Institutes] /A. V. Petrovskiy, A. V.Brushlinskiy, V. P. Zinchenko et al.; ed. A. V. Petrovskiy. – 3-d ed., revised and added. – Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1986. – 464 p. – P. 193.
 - Okon' V. Vvedenie v obshchuyu didaktiku [Introduction to general didactics] / V. Okon'. – M.: Vysshaya shkola, 1990. – 381, [1] p. – P. 204.
 - Pirogov N. I. Izbrannyye pedologicheskie sochineniya [Selected pedagogical papers] / N. I. Pirogov. – Moscow, 1985. – 496 p.
 - Rubinshteyn S. L. Chelovek i mir [Person and the world] / S. L. Rubinshteyn. – M.: Nauka, 1997. – 189 p. – (Pamyatniki psikhologicheskoy mysli). – P. 79.
 - Rubinshteyn S. L. Problemy obshchey psikhologii [Problems of general psychology] / S. L. Rubinshteyn – 2-d ed. – Moscow: Pedagogika, 1976. – 424 p. – P. 242. – P. 245.
 - Rubinshteyn S. L. Osnovy obshchey psikhologii [The basis of general psychology]: in 2 vol. / S. L. Rubinshteyn. – Moscow: Pedagogika, 1989. – Vol.1. – 488 p. – P. 347.
 - Savchenko O. Ya. Tsili i tsinnosti reformuvannya suchasnoyi osvity [Goals and values of reforms of contemporary education] / O. Ya. Savchenko // Filosofiya osvity v suchasniy Ukraini: Materialy Vseukr. nauk.-prakt. konf. – Kyiv: 1997. – P. 47–54.
 - Savchenko O. Ya. Stratehichni tsili: [Reformuvannya zah. sered. osvity] [Strategic goals: [Reforms of general secondary education] / O. Ya. Savchenko // Osvita Ukrainy. – 1997. – # 2–3. – P. 4.

27. Sukhomlyns'ka O. V. Pro stan teorii ta praktyky vykhovannya v osvnt'omu prostori [About the status of theory and educational practice in educational area] / O. V. Sukhomlyns'ka // Shlyakh osvity. – 1998. – # 3. – P. 4.
28. Ushynskiy K. D. Chelovek kak predmet vospitaniya [Person as subject of upbringing] / K. D. Ushynskiy. – S.-Pb, 1896. – Vol 2.
29. Filosofskaya entsiklopediya [Philosophy encyclopedia] / Ed. F. Konstantinov. – Moscow: Sov. entsiklopediya, 1963. – Vol. 3. – 584 p. – P. 201.
30. Chelpanov G. I. Uchebnik psikhologii: (dlya gimnaziy i samoobrazovaniya) [A Coursebook in Psychology: (for gymnasiums and self-education)] / G. I. Chelpanov. – 12th ed. – Moscow, Publishing house of the association “V. V. Dumnov, nasl. br. Salaevykh”, 1915. – VIII, 224 p.
31. Shubinskyi V. Chelovek kak tsel' vospitaniya [Person as a foal of education] / V. Shubinskyi // Pedagogika. 1992. – # 3–4.

ПЕДАГОГІЧНА КОНЦЕПЦІЯ ЛЮДИНИ – ОСНОВА НОВОЇ ФІЛОСОФІЇ ПЕДАГОГІЧНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ СУЧАСНОГО ВЧИТЕЛЯ

О. І. Виговська

Запропонована «Педагогічна концепція людини» має стати засадничою для нової філософії педагогічної діяльності.

У статті автор вводить поняття «людина», в якому центральна позиція належить не «особистості», а людині по суті, а також наводить формулу, яка фактично визначає його структурні компоненти, їх місце і роль.

Автор обґрунтовує, що затребованість Концепції спричинить радикальні зміни у педагогічній практиці.

Ключові слова: поняття «людина», його структура та формула; педагогічна концепція людини; прогнозовані зміни педагогічної практики.

ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКАЯ КОНЦЕПЦИЯ ЧЕЛОВЕКА – ОСНОВА НОВОЙ ФИЛОСОФИИ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ СОВРЕМЕННОГО УЧИТЕЛЯ

О. И. Выговская

Предложенная «Педагогическая концепция человека» должна стать основополагающей для новой философии педагогической деятельности.

В статье автор вводит понятие «человек», в котором центральная позиция принадлежит не «личности», а человеку по сути, а также приводит формулу, которая фактически определяет структурные компоненты понятия «человек», их место и роль.

Автор обосновывает, что востребованность Концепции повлечет за собой радикальные изменения в педагогической практике.

Ключевые слова: понятие «человек», его структура и формула; педагогическая концепция человека; прогнозируемые изменения педагогической практики.

Vyhovska Olha Ivanivna – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Assistant Professor, Chief and Science Editor of All-Ukrainian scientific practical magazin “Headmaster of school, liceum, gymnasium” (Kyiv, Ukraine). E-mail: vighovska@ukr.net

Виговська Ольга Іванівна – кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, головний і науковий редактор всеукраїнського наукового журналу «Директор школи, ліцею, гімназії» (м. Київ, Україна). E-mail: vighovska@ukr.net

UDC 37.017.92

SPIRITUAL FOUNDATIONS OF PLANETARY STUDENT EDUCATION

Ye. A. Zelenov

The article analyzes the spiritual foundations of planetary education of students (humanity, multiculturalism, sustainability, activity, tolerance, creativity, gnoseology). The conclusion about the need for their use in the educational process of the university is carried out.

Keywords: Spirituality, spiritual foundations, planetary education.

Problem in general and its relationship with important scientific and practical tasks. Spiritual life is the main property of the individual. The higher level of development of spirituality, the greater influence of a personality on people around, especially his/her opportunities to promote assimilation and appropriation by these people the ideals, values, norms, beliefs, this personality confesses. This primarily applies to members of those professions that are called and empowered by the society to transmit the generalized human experience, achievements of material and spiritual culture.

Views on the nature of the concepts of “spiritual” and “spirituality” vary depending on the worldview, life experience, level of general culture and education. Some people believe that spiritual is something not tangible,