Sense formation in a context of the metasystem approach

The system of values of society determines specificity of education system. One vital context is superimposed on the other, higher level (society) becomes an outline and a basis for less high level (education) and determines not only specificity of its contents and functioning, but also specificity of internal way of existence, introjections of its values in everything that gets into this context and becomes a part of it. It deduces understanding of education as multivariate reality on a new level of comprehension. In psychology and pedagogic there are many directions (absorbing achievements of previous Russian philosophy and new formations of our time) focused on “methodological principles of organic outlook” (Lossky N.O., Ostapenko A.A.), unity of everything (Solovyev V.S., Trubetskoy S.N., Florensky P.A.), integrity and completeness of life reality (Rozanov V.V., Frankl S.L.).

Special interest for the description of modern methodology of pedagogical science, and in particular theories of education, represent the theories examining this problem in a context of the metasystem approach (etymologically the concept “metasystem” specifies that some essence both belongs to a system, and lays outside of it). First of all these are researches of A.V. Karpov (2003, 2004, 2005). He suggests the metasystem approach as methodology of studying of functional laws of mentality and knowledge, proceeding from the fact that system ideas in the general theory of systems is not enough for understanding of its specificity: “Unlike the overwhelming majority of all other types, kinds and classes of systems, psychics as a system belongs to absolutely special, their qualitatively specific category which we have designated as system with a “built in” metasystem level”. Thus, it is impossible to consider metasystemness as a simple inclusiveness of a system into system of higher order (that is into metasystem). Development of metasystem methodology allows revealing “paradox of a highest level of system” as the specific two-unity inherent in organizational connections (meaning ways of interaction), determining specificity of the given system. In system hierarchy always there is a highest level which generates in itself the major distinctive properties of system, the major, solving, dominating part of it, thus nevertheless not exhausting the contents of system: “It carries out coordinating, organizing and operating functions on relations with other parts of system”. But any system (in particular complex) can be effectively organized only in the case when its “coordinating and operating” center as its object has “not any part of system, but all of it, all its contents including, certainly, all levels, including the supreme. That develops internally discrepant situation at which the highest level of system should enter into its structure, but simultaneously, should be “beyond” and “outside” of this structure, more exactly, “above” it. There is a necessity of consideration of system as a generator of external and internal in condition of isomorphism (conformities like “hand and
glove") and genetic unity of system forming factors of personality as which it is possible to consider sense in all variety of its manifestations as the sense, on the one hand, is unique generation of subjectivity of each individual, system forming factor of its personal, subjective reality (sense doesn’t exist outside of personal and human, it is intentional by the nature), and on the other it is drawn, “discrystallized” from the surrounding real world, where senses of all those people who created objects of culture, art, technique, etc. are incarnated (after A.N. Leontyev, the sense is always sense of something). The received “the double life” as a set of all contours of mental is characterized and qualitatively differs inherently from all other systems. The reality is “transposed” in personal, as metasystem with which psychics external to it and included into it cooperates, appears definitely presented in its structure and contents of the psychics itself: “the essence of mental is those, that in its own contents it is presented, the metasystem which is in relation to it initially “external” and in which it is objectively included receives existence (Leontyev D.A., 1999).

As the uniting basis of external and internal the sense can be examined from the point of view of its understanding in a context of the conceptual integrated model of sense formation (Abakumova I.V., 2003), including the most generalized, typical for all directions of research of sense components and laws. Such integrated model allows to reveal semantic dynamics and features of sense formation in various realities, in conformity with specificity of a field of semantic self-actualization. Special interest in this direction represents revealing of sense formation mechanisms in educational process as priority direction of modern didactics, especially that direction which it is possible to name semantic didactics (Abakumova I.V., Ermakov P.N., Makarova E.A., Rudakova I.A. Fomenko B.T., 2004, 2005, 2007). The metasystem approach, with an output on a sense formation problem, reflects a role of sense as link between the subject and the world, emphasizes its importance in a situation of a choice, determines connection of meaning and sense, sense and activity, sense and personality. Such model arising from theoretical premises is conceptual in its contents, and also, absorbing various gnosiological approaches, integrative. At the same time it is necessary to note, that, first, only separate conceptual positions which are present at one direction and absent in others can be captured by the model. Secondly, important, from the point of view of various directions, material can appear not so “important” from the point of view of model, i.e. construct, absorbing contents of other directions, and not to become its part. Thirdly, drawing contours of model, filling with its contents, it is necessary to get outside the limits of the analysis of the bases of sense and sense formation realized before, to address to a new theoretical and empirical material.

Native postclassical psychological theory, having passed from monosystem to metasystem way of vision of a subject of cognitive activity, has introduced a number of new principles and approaches in pedagogical science (historical and evolutional, historical and system, historical and categorical, paradigmal, contextual, etc.) which have changed the general tendency and orientation of pedagogical search both in sphere of theoretical comprehension of the didactics’ conceptual apparatus and mechanisms
of education, and in real pedagogical practice. “Crisis of the world educational sys-
tem arises because the new social order, caused by an exit of world community in
a postindustrial phase of development, cannot be executed without transition to a
new paradigm in understanding of a person. All of us we try to educate a person, not
knowing laws of human formation. Developing all new “pedagogical technologies”,
we aspire to bypass with their help own ignorance of these laws” (Klochko V.E., 1996).
This aspiration for knowing true mechanisms of educational activity, mechanisms of
process of comprehension of new at school and in real life explains that interest which
was recently shown to a problem of personal, deep, semantic aspects of education
and training in psychological and pedagogical science.