

Phenomenon of the person: from the paradigm of thinking to paradigms of formation

*Speech at the First International Science and Practical Conference
“Psychology of Education: Issues and Prospects”
(December 16–18, 2004, Moscow)*

Peculiarities of Russian realities today consist in practical modelling that goes in parallel with theoretical search, frequently even outrunning it, and the direct use of a pre-approved world experience in educational activity. Education (starting with elementary school) is being reformed with the understanding of purposes and problems that are sharply changing creative methods, style, technologies and even personal priorities and the I-concept of the teacher.

Since the time of Yan Komensky - the founder of public school and by-the-lesson team teaching (“traditional teaching”), education to a greater or lesser extent has undergone changes following political and economic social shocks.

However, in the 21st century in relation to educational psychology, a problem of creativity in the process of training and its development, as cognitive and educational psychological technologies develop, comes in the foreground.

Much research of educational problems in the last decade has led to the development of various paradigms of thinking and creativity. Each of these paradigms corresponds with a definite attitude, and with concrete psychological and professional potentials, as well as restrictions, which in the end determine the style of teaching activity and training.

Social life and education, major attributes of this life, appear objectively before a person like an aporia, an intellectual and moral problem, which presupposes an ambiguous choice, as mutually exclusive solutions are equally correct and equally essential. That is the reason why, deeds of the contemporary person are quite often inexplicably discrepant and incomprehensible even to him, i.e. they are “ambivalent” as psychologists call it, meaning that a person interprets their opposite motives and mutually exclusive feelings as being equal.

The public idea in the realm of the higher school has proven to be captive to political **antinomies**, in other words errors of concept, which are mutu-

ally exclusive, disproving each other, but at the same time making an impression that separately they can be proven to be correct with equal convincingness. And nevertheless, since Aristotle's time, there "has not been found any solution, which all would agree with".

The cardinal question, which every teacher necessarily asks himself at different stages of his teaching career is, "What do we learn THEM for?" And each time he answers in different ways. The answer that we seek inside ourselves, and around which other possible answers can form a group, consists in a very trivial postulate: for a person to self-actualize professionally.

In this case, antinomic thinking proves that each new paradigm of thinking denies the previous one and on the other hand continues to exist simultaneously. The same situation can exist in educational technologies as well.

As a matter of fact, there are as many such technologies as there are teachers of elementary school: by grounding children in reading, writing, and drawing, etc., every teacher forms not only thinking on the concrete subject, but the personality of a child, and what is not "given" at this age cannot be made up later in practice. Like in sprinting - what is lost at the start can rarely be made up at the finish. Stanislav Lem's "sum of technologies" is drawn up in a pyramid - from elementary to high school: the higher educational level is, the smaller is this sum, but larger and more powerful are technologies.

At this point, the hierarchical principle of technologies' construction is embodied here in full measure - from monoparadigmatic to interparadigmatic. Each subsequent technology involves the preceding one without substituting it but rather integrating and generalizing it.

Thus, the cyclical process of the development of cognitive procedures becomes completely apparent: the systematization and accumulation of modes for problem-analysis; the elaboration of hypothetical systems and the experimental methods required for their verification; precise theory, according to which research practice is organized; the exhaustion of explanatory force and the crisis of theory; and again, the procession to a new cycle.

The culmination of a similar cycle occurs when the theory is precisely expressed, methods of research are applied everywhere, and achievements are doubtless. Thomas Kuhn introduced the term 'paradigm' into modern usage (from Greek, meaning, 'example') to refer to a certain kind of generally accepted algorithm, on the basis of which thought process is developed in society, and which forms a collective subject of cognition.

The concept offered by T. Kuhn was valuable not in itself, but has allowed the presentation of a paradoxical phenomenology of contemporary scientific revolutions to be viewed as traditional changes of paradigms of science and to prove several particularly social moments of cognition:

- Firstly, phased development of thinking (from paradigm to paradigm);
- Secondly, the already mentioned parallel verity of the conclusions of the most recent operational paradigms of science and education (quantum and classical physics; various systems and forms of teaching, etc.);
- Thirdly, a determinative effect of a steady paradigm on all forms of creativity of the contemporaries, following along its directives till the next “mad idea” does not open a new perspective;
- Fourthly, the ability of an individual to knowingly pass into this or that paradigm depending on a subject of research or circumstance of life.

It is clear that, ‘paradigm’ is yet not everything in science. As well, science is yet not all in thinking, and thinking yet not all in mentality, but interaction between these categories is far from the unambiguity of quantitative relations. It is reasonable that, the mentality of a person potentially has adequate resources for supplying any type of outlook and any paradigm of thinking.

The question arises as to what kind of mental programs it contained at the most recent stage of development of society and which paradigms of thinking, styles of creativity, trainings and patterns of behaviour were enabled by it in the given concrete psychohistorical situation.

In Russia during the last 15-20 years stagnation and sluggishness of education has played a positive role in the political situation. The steady education system in many respects has promoted relative political and psychological stability and correspondingly – education reforms.

Today it is possible to state, that the former system with its mythical modernization yet has not given place to the new one — but there is no way back. Perceptions of national priorities in the system of all-European and world values will inevitably result in cardinal changes to the educational system.

To withstand conditions of instability that the nation experiences now, the society needs the activity, enterprise and initiative of each person as never before. The question is, on the basis of what original material is it possible to set out and approve psychosocial and educational technologies on?

In my opinion, first of all the educational technology is to be considered in every detail, and a sensible model of joint pedagogical activity for designing, organizing and conducting an educational process with very comfortable conditions for both trainee and trainer is to be traced.

An educational technology makes sense only when it is a contentively meaningful generalization and a tool of education. There is no quality for the sake of quality, even for its pseudoscientific definition. And use of tests or credit systems are not yet a change (or improvement) of quality. As a matter

of fact, “realization of ideas” is not the realization of an idea. The dynamics of “realization of ideas” more and more press the very ideas. The benefits and pragmatics are proclaimed but Kant’s “unselfishness” is forgotten.

Technologies receive their scientific status owing to the fact that teachers typically work for other than their own benefit. Hegel’s ‘dialectics’ still prevails - quantity will be transformed into quality only when a new paradigm strengthens itself in the minds of an overwhelming majority of teachers. Antinomy of educational technologies is the very condition of providing a high-quality education. I shall list some technologies, of which some parts have been mentioned in this discussion, but another one will be added.

- Contemporary forms of traditional teaching (in essence, it does not greatly differ from J.Komensky’s system of teaching)
- Pedagogical technologies based on personal orientations toward the pedagogical process (including cooperation pedagogics, the humane and personal technology of Amonashvilly, and Iljin’s system)
- Pedagogical technologies based on activation and intensification of students’ activities (game technologies, ‘problem teaching’, Passov’s technologies of communicative teaching, pedagogical technologies of intensification based on diagrammatical and alphanumerical models of Shatalov’s teaching material).
- Pedagogical technologies based on efficiency of management and organization of the educational process (technologies of level differentiation, teaching individualization (Inge Unt and Shadrikov) and programmed teaching), etc.
- Alternative technologies (Waldorf pedagogics by Steiner, technology of free work by Frene, workshops technology)
- Nature-related technologies
- Technologies of developing teaching (Zankov, Elkonin-Davidov)
- Semantic pedagogics (semantic didactics of Abakumova)
- Pedagogical technologies of author’s schools (Yamburg & Brodeh’s school of adapting pedagogics, future school of Howard, Tubelsky’s school - park), etc.

Application of all these technologies depends only on who is applying and on the presence or absence of merging paradigms of thinking. And there is no place for an idea of someone’s exclusivity. Professional competence cannot be formed only by one intellectual method.

In Soviet times there was a popular myth of our unsurpassability in generating ideas and theories: “Give us the western technologies and we shall outdo them”. We have no technologies but *ideas*, and we think them. Apparently, we all still continue to think this idea.

This is another example, but again a cultivated myth of the superiority of training of the Soviet and post-Soviet engineers. On which equipment, devices, computers, or reagents? Yes, all this is available at some elite high schools, but not to everyone. And what if it is not necessary to be available for everyone? What if it is better to concentrate resources, both human and material, in a few educational institutions, toughening selection, and to prepare young talented people to search for a better fate anywhere else, but in their native land? As it is now...

Transforming Higher School from an education system in the system of educational services is like planting a bomb under the future of our state, under our future. And what is the difference between classical education and so-called university education in the departmental and renamed institutes? It is that classical university has certain faculties or departments, while above-mentioned high school has nothing of this kind. Or maybe humanization and humanitarization of higher education has cardinaly changed the graduate of a technical college... Probably not...

The educational standard is the same everywhere. Teachers of classical universities provide an educational process in non-governmental, departmental and technical educational institutions. It is not the presence or absence of faculty and speciality that matters, but that a university be at least 90 years of age (and 200 or 300 years is even better) to deserve the right to be called 'classical'.

The flickering dichotomy between overblown-superiority and hyper-inferiority is like an incessant torture for thinking professionals and a constant threat to distorting the pedagogical process of teaching itself. There is one medicine for both of these ills: self-reflection of education in all structures of teaching and in all stages of creativity in the process of training.

Like the apostle Paul we ask: "What use is it to a man if he wins the whole world but harms his soul?"

Take care of your souls and yourselves. Thank you for attention.