

**DOI: 10.12731/2218-7405-2013-8-66**

## **THE PRINCIPLES OF THE HUMANITARIAN THINKING IN MODELING EDUCATION SYSTEMS AND PROCESSES**

Sazina I. V.

**Objective:** to consider the current conditions for modeling education systems and processes based methodologically on the principles of “the humanitarian thinking” in a special for Russia moment in history, when educational and cultural types are changing radically; to determine the subject of inquiry and the language of modeling.

**Methodology:** approaches developed by the author as a part of «the aesthetic paradigm of education»

**Results:** the subject of modeling is an integral network of moral and aesthetical values in education systems and processes based on the so-called «humanitarian thinking»; the possibly most successful models of education systems and processes are: «aesthetic education paradigm» as a complete and integral network modeling main values and purposes for strategic planning (“culture creation”) and a school everyday life; “moral (value) communication” organized through the “network interactions” (interaction between the students and the lecturer of the Pedagogical Academy as a practical model of culture-creating activity).

**Field of application:** educational process in the graduate school (teaching the Humanities), and in the secondary school as an integral network of moral and aesthetical values and purposes in the education system.

**Keywords:** cultural-and-educational type, humanitarian thinking, dialogue of cultures, «aesthetical paradigm of education», «moral (value) communication».

## **ПРИНЦИПЫ ГУМАНИТАРНОГО МЫШЛЕНИЯ В МОДЕЛИРОВАНИИ ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫХ СИСТЕМ И ПРОЦЕССОВ**

Сазина И.В.

**Цель:** рассмотреть актуальные методологические условия моделирования образовательных систем и процессов на базе принципов «гуманитарного мышления» в условиях смены культурно-образовательных типов; определить предмет и язык моделирования

**Метод/методология:** разработанные автором подходы в рамках «эстетической парадигмы образования»

**Результаты:** предмет моделирования – полная ценностная схема образовательных систем и процессов; с точки зрения принципов «гуманитарного мышления» наиболее вероятными успешными моделями образовательных процессов и систем выступают: «ценностная коммуникация», организованная с помощью «сетевых взаимодействий»; «эстетическая парадигма образования» как модель полной ценностно-смысловой схемы школы (в составе образовательной системы)

**Область применения:** образовательный процесс в вузе (преподавание гуманитарных дисциплин); средняя школа в полной ценностно-смысловой схеме образовательных процессов

**Ключевые слова:** культурно-образовательный тип, гуманитарное мышление, диалог культур, ценностная коммуникация, повседневность, школьная повседневность, эстетическая парадигма образования.

In the last twenty years Russian education has been introduced to some philosophical and cultural “projects” that now allow the educationalists to rethink critically a lot of basic cultural fundamentals in methodological approaches to the education in general. Some of these approaches and projects describe the process of

education in a range of rather untypical notions such as “dialogue”, “understanding”, “personal ways of culture-creating activity”, “answerability”, “otherness” etc. All these are coming from the theory developed by the famous philosophers V. S. Bibler, M. S. Kagan, G. S. Batistchev in their studies of M. Bakhtin. They wrote about education and worked out their philosophical projects for some of the Russian schools. A rather typical idea for their studies was the so-called “humanitarian thinking”. Actually, it was the response to the changing cultural-and-educational types, as well as to the very idea of “the dialog of cultures” that was so typical for the social life in the era of the end of totalitarianism. In brief, the set of ideas lying in the basis of “the dialogue of cultures” was a necessary methodological principle for both the theory and the practice of education (school projects of the “dialogue of cultures”). Nowadays this is regarded as the methodological task implied by:

- a) the essence of the human culture as the process of generating meanings;
- b) historical change in the cultural-and-educational types from the Enlightenment type of “the one and only true culture” to the “Plurality of Cultures” type;
- c) the multi-centric character of the contemporary pluralistic culture especially as seen through the prism of the modern “digital era”.

The term “humanitarian thinking” will be considered here in the context of “dialogical thinking” as the essential point that helps to understand the basics of “the humanitarian thinking” (and vice versa). At the same time these two notions are not equal so we must separate them, for example, when we speak about “the Humanities” or “the humanitarian knowledge” and when we refer to the theory of education or other humanitarian studies.

This kind of the humanitarian knowledge sets different educational tasks for two cultural-and-educational types: 1. “Former”, enlightening and 2. “New”, pluralistic. The traditional approach of the first type forces an individual to learn only one “ideal” or “idea” that all the people (cultures) have to follow; and within the second one individuals facing the cultural universe in its ambiguity and constant

change preserve the uniqueness of their daily life experience so that they can choose their own position towards any culture and its ideals, norms, etc. Educational model of the second type tries to actualize the meanings and the basic values of the human culture in their variety. It doesn't mean that the modern education theory rejects relatively stable value-communication and value-organizational schemes. The educational activity and its different aspects such as strategy, procedures, institutions, communications etc. are essentially determined by the models including key values and principles of the human culture.

The attitudes to “cultural ideal” are rather clear within the frame of the “old” educational paradigm. The set of the “values” that are transmitted through the educational activity seems stable and is not too complicated. It is well known to any professional as, for example, a formula including such values as “goodness, beauty, truth” to which any person is introduced and that form the fundamentals of the human culture; it is expressed as well in the principle of the “humanization of education”. As a rule, these values are actively supported by the community, the system of its norms and other mechanisms of social relations and cultural reproduction. Moreover, it is not easy to keep them as long as cultural and educational space is changing so much and its new moral fundamental dominants are not fully determined yet (or possess essential “incompleteness”). That is why a lot of professionals could not find their new ways to contact these basic values. Ambiguity and undetermined status of being “in-between” is obviously a rather clear cause of why the school remains adhere to the enlightening type of education.

So, currently, the key task of the modern theory of education in our country in general is to create models and schemes of such educational systems and processes that can realize and support the most important values of the human culture, such as knowledge, moral and aesthetical values as the essential constituent of a personality.

However, the new terms and the new cultural-and-educational type require an fresh point of view on education and somewhat different attitude to the educational institutions. It is not enough to underline the meaning of the “ideal” or to integrate it

with some obligatory social standards. The task of an educator is to prepare a person to some moral choice, to teach him/her “the courage of using the mind”, and to teach to answer the beauty in all its forms both in nature and in the fine arts. And certainly to teach to practice not only the values of his/her own culture but of other cultures as well, relating them to the key values of the human culture on the whole (as an objective content of communication). And this is the determinant of all the empirical content of the educational activity in general. The principles of the humanitarian thinking are central for organizing education around the most stable meaningful part of the human culture. It is the answer to the most profound educational demands of an individual as well as to the challenges of our “post-human” world.

The objective of modeling (both in the «old» and in the «new» educational paradigms) is building a general system of educational activities on the value basis. Its main elements are: a) the conceptual basis, expressing the major trends in culture and society nowadays and defining the cultural and educational ideal in the modern society; b) the guideline for the teachers’ independent professional activity, as an important constituent of their professional credo and civic position; c) the most important value criteria applied to the process of purposeful pedagogical influence in the spheres of social behavior and the inner world of the person formation.

This model including the daily routine of solving various pedagogical problems does not exist by itself, but within the range of meanings and objectives defined by the basic strategy of the society, i.e. it is included into the scope of the education systems in general (including ideals, ideas, fundamental universal human values, traditions, attitudes to culture and education in the community, etc.). This set only “works” together with the general principles of vision, guidelines for the world outlook, meanings and values of the culture (in general or in some specific forms developed by the community at a time and at some place). So the resulting complex model can be applied to the strategic management of the national educational systems.

The scope of the educational work (on the whole and in particular) is defined by whether certain important elements of the human culture are emphasized or are latent. The value of education itself can be a value for the parties of the educational process in two aspects: a) the parties of educational activities retain the former spiritual values under the new conditions of the culture and society development, and it is the means for their getting new knowledge, spiritual growth, moral development and a formation of a human; b) the education is seen only as something “useful” for the career. In some socio-cultural cases, these two aspects can be mutually exclusive, especially if the process of education is viewed only through the prism of its technical or technological conditions.

Theoretically all these educational tasks fall into two basic *value plans*: a) daily procedures; b) variety of social, institutional, organizational, ideological, cultural, fundamental moral and aesthetic ideas, values and meanings of education, together with the social situation and circumstances of the history, mechanisms of cultural, political, ideological conjuncture etc.

The compatibility of these two *value plans* or schemes is the most difficult task which requires special methodological reflection on the so-called “humanitarian thinking” through any educational situations in the school everyday life. Here is some very important discord: it is between the life interest and the “lofty ideal”. This discord in this or that way has always been recognized in different cultural types. For example, Hegel was quite skeptical of the divergence between the ideal and the reality: “There is nothing more common than a usual complaint, that the ideals – no matter whether they are a result of fantasy or reason ...- could not have become reality, especially often we hear the complaint that the ideals of someone’s youth have been reduced to the dream by the severe reality ... Poets described their grief about it with a touching sensitivity” (the philosopher wrote it in his “Lectures on the Philosophy of the World History, Introduction”). However, “intentions of the individuals to save the world” must be put into its own place, i.e. “individuals are only a means in the world history” [7, s.284-285]. And it is the education process that

is of the same value as the human culture, and it is considered an important step on the way to achieve the ideal of the human culture. In other words it is a kind of process of “polishing a naturally rude individual” in an attempt to bring him (“the rude individual”) to the “bright field” of culture, eventually to the field of the “absolute” human (spiritual) values.

The pluralistic culture-and-education type in its turn is focused not only on the “uniqueness” of the cultural ideal. The focus here is on the opposition of the two “worlds”: the world of everyday experience, of the uniqueness of a person’s being as an individual, on the one hand, and the “theoretical world”, “the world of culture”, on the other hand. Bakhtin speaks about it in his early text “Towards the Philosophy of the Act” and reconsiders this opposition in his later works from the point of view of such methodological intuitions and notions as “dialog”, “deed” (act), “otherness”, “answerability”, “sharing thinking” etc. “Dialog” means not simply “understanding” each other (this notion belongs to different cultures and implies interaction between different values and ideals), or some linguistic alternative to a monolog in the Bakhtin’s model. Focusing on Bakhtin's ideas, we can point out a principle of responding, “echoing” or, in Bakhtin’s terms, “refracting” of the words, utterances, positions, voices, cultures by other contents, voices, cultures and their contexts (thus, the models of the communication may be semiotic, educational etc.). The question is what implications the ideas of “answerability” or “sharing (participatory) thinking”, both constituting “humanitarian thinking”, have for the theory and practice of education today.

In short, the confrontation between the world of the everyday experience, of the uniqueness of “one’s own being” and the “theoretical world” is overcome with the help of the idea of the dialogical relations between persons or cultures and utterances. This reveals the idea of the humanitarian thinking: “not the accuracy of knowledge, but the depth of knowledge penetrating individual’s life and motives is important” [5, 7]. Identity is not attached mechanically to a man by the culture with some help of other people, but a man attaches culture to his/her personality: «The

three areas of the human culture - science, art and life become united only in the individual, which attaches them to his/her unity” [5, 7]. That is why the task of understanding educational process is very important and difficult. The context of the Russian intellectual and speech traditions adds its own specifics: that is the “utterances are not expected to produce a response”, it means we have to understand what we are hearing or reading, or the listeners must prepare themselves to respond to what they are hearing. The concept of dialogue or “dialogueness” as a principle of thinking is not equal to responsiveness (dialogueness is larger) or certain speech forms of *addressivity* (aim at certain addressees) in analyzing multiple speaking positions between differing cultures, voices etc. First of all the “humanitarian thinking” is the design, or some “theoretical device”, within educational processes and systems that requires a new justification in the Russian national system of education both in theory and practice. Principles of the “humanitarian thinking” are the construction that could bring together the “discord” between the everyday life and the theoretical world of different cultures, voices etc., and unite them in one rich polyphony of cultures. A school or a university both are the refractive field of this polyphony where we can hear the dialogue, and where we are the voices of the dialogue of cultures. The task for the theory of education (and educational systems) is to bring this idea to a person’s inner world, to the “uniqueness” of a person, let the dialogue participate in our life.

The national system of education has experienced a variety of forms of the “discord” (between the life interest and the “lofty cultural and educational ideal”). For example, it is the criticism of the very concept «education» from the specifically Russian cultural and mental position that understands the concept of education as “bringing-up”. So, M. S. Kagan believed that “bringing-up pedagogy” faces the problems that educational pedagogy can’t see or solve. The term “education” contains a dangerous practice of its reduction to the live communication between an individual and culture. The “bringing-up pedagogy” is based on “education”, but has a different nature and focuses on a different ideal [9; 10,183 - 185]. This proves that

the object of modeling must be the full value scheme of educational systems and processes. And the scheme itself must include all the varieties of the meaning of the term “education”, including some abstract notion (human education or “educationality” of a person), as well as specific practices of the everyday pedagogical activities (such as upbringing, learning, teaching, using or communicating skills, etc.).

But the problem is that the national school does not follow the “notional paradigm” [2; 3]. And the humanitarian meaning of the term “education” is not quite defined today, especially in connection with modern educational practices (as it is announced in the Russian philosophical and pedagogical tradition of the XIX and XX centuries). The underdevelopment of the humanitarian meaning of the term “education” concerns the meaning of the term “dialogue”, which is replaced by the verbal communication technology in didactics. It is unacceptable from the position of the “humanitarian thinking” which is the way and the instrument of the “notional paradigm” and one of the principles of modeling in education.

The problem is evident, especially when we consider some strong tendency of the pragmatically oriented educational needs of the young people today, and that is indicated by national sociological researches.

1. There is a contradiction between the basic conception of educating a human being which is traditional for the Russian culture-creating ideology (it is stated as “the traditional attitude to education, enshrined in the mental structures of the Russians” [8, 89]) and the pragmatical attitude to education that is being actively formed in the minds of many young people (in the situation when the national system of education is being actively modernized).

2. As sociological researches and surveys report the main factor leading to the situation when young people seek for education of an instrumental character is that “education is considered first of all as a means of achieving prospective competitive position at the job market, only then as a way of acquiring knowledge. The vast majority of the young people is focused on getting any education with a minimum of

effort for the diploma alone” (every third of the respondents). This means that “the young people, focusing on the internal problems of survival in our difficult and violent time, wish to obtain such culture and education that will help them to survive and succeed” [4, 62].

Theorists point out that “moral aspects of the young people’s guidelines in education understood as the humanistic ideals and values is not on the mass scale yet» in modern Russia [11, 92]. Solving this problem depends on the answers to the following questions: how “humanistic ideals” are coming into the everyday life of the individuals and educational institutions in their various implementations (such as civil skills, science knowledge, etc.), and how the process of education (in schools and universities) provides a link between culture and personality in the society. Actually, education which helps a person to develop the capacity for value communication and social action on the basis of the creative mastering of the culture-centered “semantic dominants” is socially valuable. This can be achieved only within the “notional paradigm”, which turned out to be the keystone that “the builders rejected”.

Nowadays it is logical that our society formed by the development of the human civilization in general requires more and more people possessing the skills of “reciprocal intersubjective relations”. Sociologists see it as a condition of self-organization and self-determination in the society [1]. But the internal stimulus for the dynamics is the “humanitarian thinking” as the key principle (modeling all processes in education).

The adequate methodological key to solving the problem is undoubtedly the “humanitarian thinking” which is positioned as some “light field” where we can find a wide range of conditions for modeling. This methodology concerns basic issues of spiritual culture with empirical content of educational activities in the communicative, social, institutional and existential aspects. The results in the sphere of education are depending on the degree of its development in general as well as in every issue that this methodology concerns. Russian scholars believe that this field,

identified by W. Dilthey as a scientific spiritual and humanitarian thought, and nowadays experiencing changes under the influence of phenomenology, existentialism, philosophical anthropology, philosophy of dialogue, exist today only as a set of rather separate directions and approaches. That is why they consider it necessary to thoroughly develop the epistemology of the “humanitarian thinking” [12].

Nevertheless, certain parts of the Bakhtin's concept of the “humanitarian thinking” (including the theory of dialogue) were realized by various domestic educational practices. It is clear now that this concept in its essence reflects the tendencies in the development of the world culture on the whole. We are talking about the tendency we can experience now with the “information era” coming. And what M. M. Bakhtin did for the educational process is that he had treaded the paths in a field of transcendental philosophical ideas, leading directly to the existence of a personality in the everyday life. This is “humanitarian thinking”. And it is extremely important for the sphere of education.

Certainly, there is some research area of cultural and epistemological interpretation of Bakhtin's ideas both in the West and in Russia. And educational experience as modeling with a help of the “humanitarian thinking” brings some special characteristics to this area as well. Today “humanitarian thinking” and its models in education give an opportunity to “read the text” of the everyday school life as the condition of personal and spiritual growth. It is one of the first major guidelines in creating working models of educational systems and processes in a new cultural-and-educational type. It must be emphasized that everyday communication in the situation of learning strongly correlates with the objective content. Bakhtin claims this in his text “Towards to the Philosophy of the Act”. It is important for the pedagogical situation (learning, for example) as well as for the epistemology of the “humanitarian thinking”.

The principles of the “humanitarian thinking” let us understand not only the pluralistic character of modern culture, but the way (or ways) of achieving a cultural

ideal. The culture-creating process may remain in a latent state but its most important aspects are the content of modern education experience and value communication in educational processes.

The Bakhtin's methodological intuition allows us to see and take into account the following conditions:

1. Basic character of culture-creating process, defined by the peculiarities of the school everyday life (the school «chronotope») or a lack of the sufficient strength of the methodological intention of the culture-creating ideas, the methodological difficulty of expressing it for pedagogical knowledge (lack of access to the organizational sphere of models, projects, etc.).

2. Imperfection of the institutional system of national education, the lack of the humanitarian competence of the managers; untapped basic concepts of social phenomenology of domestic concepts and practices, frequent “didactic reduction” of the teacher-student dialogue to specific techniques, varieties of “educational technologies”, the inability to distinguish dialogue from “communication consisting of notional dominants of the specific act of communication” [1], etc.

Today, significant opportunities for simulation in accordance with the principles of the “humanitarian thinking” become more realistic due to the development of the value-communicative approach to the analysis of the educational practices. The dialogue in the media landscape during the study of the Humanities in the graduate school - that is, in many ways, the answer to the changes in culture and society, which are caused by the growth and multiplication of mass media and communication problems generated by it, which opens new axiological, semiotic, cultural horizons of education (especially in the Humanities).

Educational dialogue may become a genuine communication as it transfers to the Global Network, which today is a polyphonic space, and an appropriate instrument for such a dialogue. “Network communication” in the educational dialogue ensure what the “dialogue” implies as its integral feature, namely spontaneous meaningful interaction. The niche of the culture on the Net can give a

student access to the polyphony of meanings, the variety of cultures, which is very important. Educational perspective of the “networking” arises because the Internet has not only the potentially negative impact on the minds of the young people.

One of the positive effects is the fact that the Web offers a variety of “educational” sites. Today the parties of the network interactions are diverse cultural groups, community initiatives (museums, libraries, publishing houses), which are genuine culture-bearers. We see the formation of a “cultural bay” in the Global Network. It is an element of the school daily life as well.

The humanitarian component of these communities is gaining momentum, opening up new forms, offering new content and new opportunities for value-semantic communication. Spontaneous network interactions, the process of selecting published texts correspond to the principles of dialogue as a necessary element of the “humanitarian thinking” and transfer to the educational dialogue rather easily.

The main directions of modeling educational systems and processes that cover full network of values in the educational activity are as follows:

1. In the school daily life: a personal addressivity in its harmony and contradictions with all educational procedures (sharing and answerability) including an educational dialogue in the media landscape (especially in teaching the Humanities such as Philosophy, World Fine Arts and Culture and Cultural Studies).

2. From the point of value-communicative approach and analysis: the understanding of difference between the dialogue and mere communication, moving towards moral communication that consists of “semantic dominant communicative act” [1].

The aesthetical paradigm of education [13] is a most convenient coming model able to solve all these problems in the field of education. It contains and reveals all the “approaches” and effective active models, relevant equally to everyday life and the “lofty ideal”, open to the idea of dialogue between cultures. This model can accommodate both the educational “ideal” and the searches for a new value-based “era of freedom” (pluralistic type of human culture). The principles of the

humanitarian thinking are easily seen in this paradigm; moreover, there are a lot of new “tools” for solving educational problems. One of these is the “network interaction”. Other is modern art or the possibility for students to create “installations”, “performances” (on-line or off-line) and so on.

Let's sum up.

Firstly, the principles of the humanitarian thinking concerning full value model of education (“concept”, “credo”, “value’ criteria”) are concentrated and expressed by the Bakhtin’s term “dialogue” (personality, life, dialogue, participatory, cultural unity, the unity of the person etc.). They allow us to take into account the plurality of cultural positions, keeping the basic spiritual values and traditions taking into consideration a person’s internal values and his/her educational needs.

Secondly, creating successful models of educational systems and processes requires:

1. Revision of *the deep cultural foundations and methodological orientations* of the educational activity (goal-setting, personal educational needs, educational design, constant area of value schemes in the educational activity) relevant to the changing cultural and educational types.

2. Understanding the “humanitarian thinking” in education as ideas and cultural values “merging into life” (in combination with the personal type of relation to them) changing the direction of a communication in culture: a person does not move step by step to the values of “high” culture, - a person as “the unity” attaches culture to its own unity; or culture joins “the unity” of a person.

3. Application of the principles of the “humanitarian thinking” (personality, life, dialogue, participatory, cultural unity, the unity of the person) to the “old” and, at the same time, to the “new” educational paradigm, helping to keep the value of the traditional (not pragmatic) attitude to education together with its new characteristics.

4. Understanding the principles and practices of the “humanitarian thinking” as a go-between in a complex scheme of value educational activities (combining the two different educational paradigms).

5. Constructing educational system models in the way most relevant to a new cultural-and-educational type way within the “aesthetic paradigm of education”.

## References

1. Adamjanc T.Z., *Obshhestvennye nauki i sovremennost'*, no 1 (2012): 27-46.  
[http://www.isras.ru/files/File/publ/Adamyants\\_Massovoe\\_socioment\\_razvitie.pdf](http://www.isras.ru/files/File/publ/Adamyants_Massovoe_socioment_razvitie.pdf)  
(accessed June 11, 2013).

2. Asmolov A., Kondakov A. *Obrazovanie v Rossii: ot kul'tury polezности k kul'ture dostoinstva* [Education in Russia: from the culture of usefulness to the culture of dignity], *Pedagogika*, no 7 (2004): 3-11.

3. Valickaja A. *Kul'turotvorcheskaja shkola: koncepcija i model' obrazovatel'nogo processa* [Culture-creative school: the concept and model of educational process], *Pedagogika*, no 4 (1998): 12-18.

4. Bannikova L., Boronina L., Vishnevskij Ju. *SOCIS*, no 2 (2013): 58-68.

5. Bahtin M. *K filosofskim osnovam gumanitarnyh nauk, Sbornie sochinenij* [Towards the philosophical basics of humanitarian studies], T. 5. Raboty 1940-h - nachala 1960-h godov, Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996.

6. Bahtin M. *Jestetika slovesnogo tvorcestva* [Aesthetics of word's cration]. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979.

7. Gegel, Georg Vil'gel'm Fridrih. *Jestetika* [Aesthetics]. V 4-h tomah. T. 4. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1973.

8. Zubok Ju., Chuprov V. *SOCIS*, no 1 (2013): 78-90

9. Kagan M. [http://antropology.ru/tests/Kagan/repr\\_1.html](http://antropology.ru/tests/Kagan/repr_1.html) (accessed June 11, 2013).

10. Kagan M. *Voprosy filosofii*, no 2 (2008): 183-185.

11. Magaril S. *SOCIS*, no 12 (2012): 89-96.

12. Mahlin V. *Vtoroe soznanie: Podstupy k gumanitarnoj jepistemologii* [The Second Consciousness: Approaches to the humanitarian epistemology]. Moscow: Znak. 2012.

13. Sazina I. *Jesteticheskaja paradigma ob'razovanija. Vvedenie v pomstanovku problemy* [Aesthetical Paradigm of Education. Introduction to the Posing of the Problem]. Saratov: Nauchnaja kniga, 2009.

### **Список литературы**

1. Адамьянц Т. З. Массовое социо-ментальное развитие: миф или возможность? // *Общественные науки и современность*. 2012. № 1. С. 27 – 46  
[http://www.isras.ru/files/File/publ/Adamyants\\_Massovoe\\_socioment\\_razvitie.pdf](http://www.isras.ru/files/File/publ/Adamyants_Massovoe_socioment_razvitie.pdf)

(дата обращения 11 июня 2013 г.)

2. Асмолов А. Г., Кондаков А. И. Образование России: от культуры полезности к культуре достоинства // *Педагогика*, № 7, 2004 С. 3-11

3. Валицкая А. П. Культуротворческая школа: концепция и модель образовательного процесса // *Педагогика*, № 4, 1998. С. 12-18

4. Банникова Л. Н., Боронина Л. Н., Вишневикий Ю. Р. Новые явления в ценностных ориентациях уральского студенчества // *СОЦИС*, № 2, 2013. С. 58-68

5. Бахтин М. М. К философским основам гуманитарных наук // М. М. Бахтин. *Собрание сочинений*. Т.5. Работы 1940-х – начала 1960-х годов. М.: Русские словари, 1996.

6. М. М. Бахтин. *Эстетика словесного творчества*. М.: Искусство. 1979.

7. Гегель Г. В. Ф. *Эстетика*. В 4-х томах. Т.4. М.: Искусство, 1973.

8. Зубок Ю. А., Чупров В. И. Социо-культурный механизм формирования отношения молодежи к образованию // *СОЦИС*, № 1, 2013. С. 78-90.

9. Каган М. С. *Воспроизводство российской интеллигенции как педагогическая проблема* [http://antropology.ru/tests/Kagan/repr\\_1.html](http://antropology.ru/tests/Kagan/repr_1.html) (веб-

публикации кафедры философской антропологии СПбГУ), дата обращения 11 июня 2013 г.

10. Каган М. С. Рецензия на книгу А. С. Запесоцкого «Образование: философия, культурология, политика». М.: Наука, 2002// Вопросы философии, №2, 2008. С.183 - 185

11. Магарил С. А. Социо-гуманитарное образование: невыученные уроки // СОЦИС, 2012, № 12. С. 89-96

12. Махлин В. Л. Второе сознание: Подступы к гуманитарной эпистемологии. М.: Знак. 2012.

13. Сазина И. В. Эстетическая парадигма образования. Введение в постановку проблемы. Саратов: Научная книга, 2009.

14. Хорошее общество: Социальное конструирование приемлемого для жизни общества. Под ред. В.Г. Федотовой. М.: ИФ РАН, 2003.

#### **DATA ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

**Sazina Irina Vladimirovna**, Docent of chair “Universal History, Philosophy and Social Sciences”, PhD.

*Kuzbass State Pedagogical Academy*

*13, Pionerskiy ave., Novokuznetsk, Kemerovo region, 654027, Russia*

*e-mail: vainona@yandex.ru*

#### **ДААННЫЕ ОБ АВТОРЕ**

**Сазина Ирина Владимировна**, доцент кафедры «Всеобщей истории, философии и социальных наук», кандидат философских наук

*Кузбасская государственная педагогическая академия*

*просп. Пионерский, д. 13, г. Новокузнецк, Кемеровская область, 654027, Россия*

*e-mail: vainona@yandex.ru*

*SPIN-код 2342-7124*