

RESEARCH OF THE PROBLEM OF DIALOGUE EDUCATION
IMPLEMENTATION IN THE FUTURE PRIMARY SCHOOL
TEACHERS' TRAINING PROCESS:
PHILOSOPHICAL AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH

KATERYNA FOMIN

Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University (Ukraine)
e-mail: aerosweett@ukr.net

ABSTRACT: *The article defines the basic theoretical principles of philosophical and pedagogical anthropology in the organizing process of dialogue training of primary school teachers. The author analyzes the methodology of the outlined problem in the historical retrospective – from the ideas of ancient Greek philosophers to scientific works of modern scholars and teachers. The importance of implementing an anthropological approach to the organization of the dialogue training and education of the child is emphasized, particularly in the elementary school educational process. It is substantiated that philosophical and pedagogical anthropology allows to thoroughly analyze the essence of a person, her spiritual world; to realize the uniqueness of the inner world of each individual; to consider the idea according to which humanity has no future without proper unity, dialogue of cultures, interaction and communication, etc. The author argues that the implementation of the principle of dialogue in the educational process is a real change in the direction of activity: from knowledge - to creative thinking and human culture.*

KEY WORDS: *dialogue training, philosophical and pedagogical anthropology, future teachers, primary school*

INTRODUCTION

One of the important conditions for qualitative scientific research is the definition and justification of its methodological principles. This is emphasized by well-known Ukrainian and foreign scientists (Andrushchenko, 2012; Bekh, 2015; Bykov, 2009; Budnyk, 2014; Vasianovych, 2015; Husserl, 2009; Zyazyun, 2004; Kremen, 1998; Scheler, 1994; Schedrovitsky, 1993; Mazur, Miterka, 2012; and others).

Besides, the term "methodology" until now is treated differently, and still is not well-established in scientific circulation. Some of the scientists offer a narrow interpretation of this term, considering it to be a set of teaching techniques (Novykov, 2005; Sychyvytsia, 2001). It is likely that any idea in science has the right to exist, instead we consider a much broader understanding of the science of methodology, as S. Honcharenko wrote about it. The scientist argued that the methodology – is "... a system of principles and methods for constructing theoretical and practical activities, as well as the doctrine of this system", "the doctrine of the method of scientific knowledge and transformation of the world" (Honcharenko, 2008, p. 498-500). In our research we will support the idea according to which the concept "methodology" includes four main components: a) general philosophical; b) general scientific; c) specific scientific ideas; d) teaching about methods (Budnyk, 2016, p. 9-14; Vasianovych, 2015, p. 164-186). This interpretation of the methodology is found in many works, especially in the books of academics: S. Honcharenko (1997), M. Danilov (1971) and others. In this article, we will consider a problem that is associated with the organization of dialogue training of primary school teachers so it is advisable to decide on the essence of key concepts. The category "dialog" (gr. dialogs) has two main meanings: 1) conversation between two or more subjects; 2) oral literary work, written in the form of a conversation (Slovar, 1988).

We will use the first meaning, instead we will not confine ourselves to the "conversation between subjects of communication", but also determine the meaning of this communication, its spiritual value. Such an understanding of the problem of dialogue, as evidenced by the analysis of philosophical and pedagogical sources, has a certain tradition and sufficient level of substantiation (a very good example of it are dialogues between a teacher (Socrates) and a pupil (Platon, 1996)).

Modern pedagogy offers different contexts of understanding the notion of "dialogue education", however, we note that even in the "Encyclopedia of Education" it is absent, there is only a general definition of the "dialogue of cultures", which was consistently defined by the prominent scholars: M. Bakhtin and V. Bibler. In this book it is only mentioned that "Education dialogue of cultures can be observed in the process of studying real texts of a particular culture and in the form of creating student's texts modeling various situations, internal and intercultural dialogue, dialogical forms of teaching (lessons-dialogues, discussions, etc.); involvement in games and cultural activities; defining a certain cross-cutting problem and solving it together with pupils, which can gradually in the following classes "draw in itself" all the problems, topics, generation gaps, cultures in their dialogue" (Encyclopedia of Education, 2008, p. 217). In our opinion, the most successful in the functional sense the concept "dialogue education" is given in the work "Pedagogical Skill" edited by Academician I. Zyazyun (Pedahohichna maisternist, 1997, p. 204-208). It is not difficult to understand from the context given by him, that the dialogue education is considered to be a dialogical communication and contact (interaction) between a teacher and a student. He wrote: "Teaching dialogue is a type of professional communication, which meets the criteria of the dialogue, providing subject-subjective principle of interaction between a teacher and students." And then Academician I. Zyazyun defines the main criteria of the dialogue, the leading among them are as follows: 1) recognition of the equality of personality positions, openness and trust; 2) the interlocutor's priority and mutual influence of views; 3) the modality of statements and personalization of the message; 4) polyphony of interaction and provision of developmental assistance by the teacher; 5) the dual teacher's role in communication (Pedahohichna maisternist, 1997, p. 205-208). Academician S. Honcharenko used the notion of "dialogue in education", he considered it to be the form of pedagogical interaction between a teacher and a student (student - student) under educational conditions, in the course of which there is information exchange, mutual influence and regulated relations. The specificity of the educational dialogue is determined by the goals, conditions and circumstances of interaction (Honcharenko, 1997, p. 96; Mazur, 2017). A significant number of Ukrainian scholars-teachers (I. Dichkivska, O. Pekhota,

G. Selevco, etc.) consider dialogue teaching as a modern, effective educational technology, which is humanistic in nature and promotes productive intellectual and sensory development of the child.

Taking into consideration the subject of our research in this article we substantiate the essence of philosophical and pedagogical anthropology as a methodological approach in the organization of the dialogue education of students at the pedagogical university.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analyzing this extremely important problem has been under the way since ancient times. For the first time the human nature, his physiological, psychological, social, spiritual and moral qualities (namely, in this aspect anthropology considers a person, his behavior and behavioral activity), was appealed to by Socrates, and later – by his disciples: Aristif, Kratte, Diodorus, Xenophon, and especially – Plato. It was Socrates who used the "method of possession" for the first time (a method of dialogue that allow "to bring up" truth and the person himself). Particular attention should be paid to Aristotle's understanding of the essence of the person who was considered to be "the prince of philosophers" of ancient Greece. He proposed the method of activities, emphasizing that human nature is best revealed in labor, creativity, but it is necessary to create proper conditions. With the help of dialogue training, according to the genius philosopher and teacher, morally responsible youth is educated, serving as the main means of preserving the state. Therefore, the organization of youth education is the first task of the state and every teacher. In his work "Politics" Aristotle wrote: "And since the state in its integrity implies one ultimate goal, then, it is clear that everyone needs identical education and care for this education should be universal, not a private matter, as it is now, when everyone cares about raising their children in their own way and teaches his own way what he wants. What has a common interest must be solved in a common way. Do not, moreover, think that every citizen exists by himself. No. All citizens belong to the state, because each of them is a part of the state. And taking care of every part, of course, must be considered as the care of the whole" (Aristotel, 1983, p. 628).

In the Middle Ages the situation with treatment of the nature of human learning and education has been changing dramatically. The main idea is that a person becomes subordinate to God. The mediator in the "person-God" dialogue is Jesus Christ. Prayer becomes the main means of communication, dialogue, it is also the main means of the person's self-knowledge and self-improvement. One of the most famous Christian thinker of that time Augustine Blessed in his work "Teacher" in a conversation with his son Addead, outlines all the important features that are necessary for a teacher so that through dialogue training he could actively raise a child. First of all, he must love God, be kind, compassionate, have diverse knowledge, show modesty and justice. The thinker had a very negative attitude to those teachers who were not demanding to students, preferred money, not education, science, because it is dangerous not only for the individual but also for the state. The famous French philosopher Pierre Abelard also followed theological views on human nature and possibilities of training and education. Though, in his works, "Know yourself", "Yes and No", "The History of My Troubles", the philosopher and teacher expressed the opinion, according to which, a person should put a voice of conscience above the commandments of God. Conscience defines the meaning and value of actions that are not value themselves, but due to the motives they induce. In the process of dialogue education, the teacher should value the slightest sign of student's independent thinking, his creative growth, in no way inhibit success in learning, if the student has not adequately paid for financially. The teacher has no right to envy the student if he realizes that the student has exceeded his knowledge. Such situations, when the future philosopher was deprived of the dialogue with his teacher, suffered all kinds of mockery, humiliation of dignity, were described with great sadness in his work (Abelyar, 1994, p. 302-304; Famuła-Jurczak, Mazur, 2012).

A new burst of development dialogue education got during the Renaissance and New Age era. This is primarily due to the changing attitude towards the person, his essence and aims. The determining factor in his development became freedom, humanistic thinking and human relations. Especially it was typical for such European thinkers, teachers, as F. Bacon, T. Hobbes, Y. Komenskiy, John Locke, M. Montaigne, I. Pestalozzi, E. Erasmus, Spinoza and others. The sources that came to us allow us to state: the most famous teacher of the early Renaissance was Vittorino Rambaldoni (Vittorino da Feltre). His school was called "House of happiness" or "House of Games", "House of Joy"

because the entire educational process in it was built on the principle of a dialogue. At school, children with different backgrounds, both wealthy and poor, were trained, all students were on equal terms. As Vittorino da Feltre followed the principles of philosophical and pedagogical anthropology, humanistic ideas, he believed that all children from birth are equal and free, all of them should be developed harmoniously, individually, but necessarily with the help of games and direct communication. It is quite right that Vittorino da Feltre's system of education was called "Pedagogy of Love" by his contemporaries and followers: Guarino de Verona, Peter Vergerius and others (God, 2004, p. 316-318).

A French thinker Michel Montaigne, who highly appreciated da Feltre's pedagogical activity for his humane attitude towards the child, adherence to the principle of individualization of teaching, wrote: "If teachers teach their many students, as it is mostly done, giving them all the same lesson and demanding from them the same behavior, although their abilities are not the same in strength and in character, then there is nothing surprising that among a large number of children there are only two or three children who are genuinely benefiting from such training" (Monten, 1991).

So, given above shows that anthropological approach to dialogue education was characteristic of progressive Renaissance philosophers and teachers. The most striking example of this was J.A. Comenius theoretical and practical activity. Who did the famous teacher consider to be an ideal person? He stated that a person should be holistic, humane, with a high level of consciousness and responsibility. This, according to J.A. Comenius, is the main goal of education and upbringing. In this sense, he wrote: "... the threefold purpose of educating the youth must be firmly established: 1. Faith in piety. 2. Good behavior. 3. Knowledge of languages and sciences. And all this in the order in which it is proposed here, and not vice versa. First of all, it is necessary to teach children piety, then – good behavior, in the end – more useful sciences. The larger progress in this last point they will be able to make, the better" (Comenius, 1982, p. 207; Budnyk, Vasianovych, 2017, p. 85-89).

This outstanding teacher emphasized that the goal is not predetermined and realized with the help of only external factors, but stems from the very nature of a person, it direct him to self-improvement, responsible human destiny – to be human. According to J.A. Comenius's humanistic plan: "To teach everyone everything", his opinion on dialogue education is extremely fruitful, in the process

of which there is a trustful dialogue, mutual enrichment of souls: a student and a teacher acquires the necessary life experience, etc. The problem however is that not every teacher is well prepared for such training. A teacher who is unable to disclose his soul to a student, injures his pupil's desire to know the world, others and himself.

On this basis J.A. Comenius made an appropriate conclusion that too formalized teacher's activities, activities not according to conscience leads to the fact that nothing is in order in the world dominated by hatred, violence, theft, murder. The true teacher obeys only his own conscience, and does justice, honestly, under all circumstances. Only on the basis of dialogue training a close unity in the relationship between a teacher and a student is formed (Comenius, p. 178).

Such an approach was consistently followed in his pedagogical activity by J. Pestalozzi, who emphasized that the teacher had to be a millionaire of morality, intelligence and physical strength. He must love children, know their needs, constantly help them in spiritual and physical growth. Respect for the student's personality, parental care for children who were socially neglected, orphans, led him to almost twenty-four hour stay and communication with them, as he wrote to his friend: "My hand laid in their hand, my eyes looked in their eyes. My tears flowed with their tears, and my smile accompanied their smile" (Pestalozzi, 1981, p. 54).

The most complete form of philosophical and pedagogical anthropology was proved by the ingenious thinker and teacher K. Ushynsky. The scientist supports the idea that anthropology is the science of human knowledge in all its integrity. He treated critically representatives of various philosophical and pedagogical trends, who interpreted too simply the person's essence, his quality and purpose. In particular, the scientist categorically denied the views of the representatives of so-called nativeism (J. Muller, K. Stumpf), who claimed that a person is born already with ready ideas, so training and education only direct this process of idea and quality development. He also denied the ideas of representatives of empiricism (J. Locke, E. Condillac, etc.), who considered the person to be a "clean board", and the educator could write on it down everything he considered to be necessary.

K. Ushynsky proved that a person is constantly in a dynamic development, creative search, therefore, the teacher in his work should be well aware of this and

do everything necessary to develop the creative potential of the individual. It is worthwhile, in our opinion, to pay attention to such an important aspect: the thinker and educator emphasized that human heredity is much more important for the person than organic heredity, which is definitely evident in habits, inclinations, instead, under no circumstances it will replace the need for conscious self-expression, self-reflection. That's why K. Ushynsky believed that teacher who was guided in its activities by philosophical and pedagogical anthropology was able to prepare a child for a real, free, decent life. In his fundamental work, "A Person as a Subject of Education: The Experience of Pedagogical Anthropology" (Ushynsky, 2004), the scientist noted that a wide range of anthropological sciences include: anatomy, human physiology and pathology, psychology, logic, philology, geography, which studies the Earth as people's place of life, statistics, political economy and history in the broad sense, including the history of religion, civilization, philosophical systems, literature, arts and proper education in the narrow sense of the word. All these sciences consist of facts which are taught, correlated and grouped together and those correlations of facts influence the subject of education that is a person (Ushynsky, 2004, p. 15). In this works K. Ushynsky thoroughly outlined the physiological data and the whole process of consciousness from primary sensations to complex processes of reasoning. He also highlighted the processes of emotional feelings, human spiritual characteristics, therefore, the emphasis was done on individual anthropology. Such an approach, as K. Ushynsky emphasized, aims to clarify the conditions and opportunities for the upbringing of the child. And first of all, "the educator must strive to get to know the real person, with his all weaknesses and in greatness, with his routine, petty needs and with all his great spiritual needs. The educator must know the person in the family, in society, among people, among mankind and alone with his conscience, in all age classes, in all classes, in all circumstances, in joy and grief, in elevation and humiliation, in the fullness of forces and in a state of illness, among unlimited hopes and a non-fatal hiding place, when the word of human comfort is already powerless. He must know the motive reasons of the dirtiest and the highest acts, the history of the birth of criminal and major thoughts, the history of the development of any passion and any kind of character. Only then he will be able to get means of educational influence from the very human nature, and these means are enormous" (Ushynsky, 2004, p. 25). And further, the scientist warns that it is not enough for

the teacher to remember facts of various sciences, which could become pedagogical rules, one must still be able to compare these facts and thus achieve a complete understanding of how exactly, in what forms, methods and means they can be used productively in the educational process. K. Ushynsky considered dialogue education one of the most effective forms of this process, which allows not formally, but actually and effectively develop the personality, his integrity, completeness.

The analysis of a large array of scientific sources shows that a powerful step in substantiating the methodology based on philosophical and pedagogical anthropology was made by prominent scholars M. Scheller (1994) and Teilhard de Chardin (1987). So, M. Scheller argued that there was an urgent need to face the person because he had never been so problematic as that day. In addition, the researcher expressed the opinion that the person is a dichotomous creature: on one hand, he belongs to the animal kingdom, and on the other – he is radically different from it. In his opinion, "Spirit" expresses the superficial and active essence of the person. The spirit is the personal center of the person. Only having the Spirit a person is able to live freely, to be open to the world. And, on the contrary, the person deprived of the Spirit (center) is not free, he is unable to realize his potential forces in the outer space in which his "sensual impulse" is dying out.

Teilhard de Chardin proved a slightly different approach to the clarification of nature, origin, meaning of being and in general the integral characterization of the person as a biological and supra-biological (conscious) creature. The scientist tried to find out: why a person becomes what he is in reality, and predict what kind of person he might become in the future. He stressed that the human race is capable of continuing to exist only in the conditions of cosmological unity, and this requires a high level of consciousness of each person, understanding, dialogue thinking and joint action. A person is the center of the universe, and in this dimension he has the prospect of self-development. But "a person is not a static center of the world, as he has thought about it for a long time, but the axis and peak of evolution, which is much more beautiful" (Chardin, p. 40).

It is worth noting that today the idea of human centeredness is actively and consistently developing in philosophical and pedagogical anthropology (V. Andrushchenko, H. Vasianovych, I. Zyazyun, V. Kremen, etc.).

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the above mentioned facts we can draw conclusions about the importance of the methodology of philosophical and pedagogical anthropology for scientific research, which is aimed at solving the problem of organizing dialogue training for future primary school teachers:

First, one can thoroughly analyze the person's essence, existence, his spiritual and inner world.

Second, realize that each person has his own, unique inner center and the world.

Third, the study must take into account the view that humanity has no future without proper unity, dialogue of cultures, interaction and communication.

Fourth, the dialogue is presented as a form of training in conditions of freedom, as a teacher and student's interaction based on humanism.

The implementation of the principle of dialogue in the educational process is a real change in the vector: from knowledge to creative thinking and human culture.

Fifth, when analyzing the problem of dialogue training, one should take into account the personification of the interlocutor's message in the dialogue process, since without it the exchange of views may be formal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Abelyar, P.(1994) Istoriya moih bedstviy. In: Antologiya pedagogicheskoy myisli hristianskogo Srednevekovya (p. 302-304), vol.1, Moskva: AO Aspekt Press.
- Andrushchenko, V. P. (2012). Rozdumy pro osvitu: filosofii i metodolohiia. Kyiv: MP Lesia.
- Aristotel (1983). Politika. Moskva: Myisl.
- Bekh, I. D. (2015). Metodolohichniy prostir suchasnoho vykhovnoho protsesu. In: Vybrani naukovy pratsi, vol. 1, Vychovannia osobystosti (p. 600-650), Chernivtsi: Bukrek.
- Budnyk, O. (2016). Educational Model of a Modern Student: European Scope. Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 3, 2-3, 9-14, doi:10.15330/jpnu.3.2-3.9-14.

- Budnyk, O. B. (2014). Profesiina pidhotovka maibutnoho uchytelia pochatkovoï shkoly do sotsialno-pedahohichnoi diialnosti: teoriia i metodyka. Dnipropetrovsk: Seredniak T. K.
- Budnyk, O., Vasianovych, H. (2017). The Category of freedom in the written heritage of John Amos Comenius and Hryhoriy Skovoroda. *Advanced Education*, 7, 85-89, doi: 10.20535/2410-8286.93517.
- Bykov, V. Y. (2009). *Modeli orhanizatsiinykh system vidkrytoi osvity*. Kyiv: Atika.
- Chardin, de T. (1987). *Fenomen cheloveka*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Comenius, J. (1982). *Izbrannyye pedagogicheskie sochineniya*. Moskva: Pedagogika.
- Danilov, M. A. (1971). *Problemy metodologii pedagogiki i metodiki issledovaniya*. Moskva: Pedagogika.
- Encyclopedia of Education (2008). Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter.
- Famuła-Jurczak, A., Mazur, P. (2012). Where is it going school?. In: B. Akimjaková, I. Rochovská (ed.), *Tradition and Innovation in Special and Social Pedagogy* (p. 83-101), Ružomberok: Verbum.
- God, B. V. (2004). *Vihovannya v epohu Evropeyskogo Vidrodzhennya (seredina HIV – pochatok HVII stolittya)*. Poltava: ASMI.
- Gusserl, E. (2009). *Idei chistoy fenomenologii i fenomenologicheskoy filosofii*. Moskva: Akademich. proekt.
- Honcharenko, S. (1997). *Ukrainskyi pedahohichnyi slovnyk*. Kyiv: Lybid.
- Honcharenko, S. U. (2008). Metodolohiia. In: *Entsyklopediia osvity* (p. 498-500), Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter.
- Honcharenko, S. U. (2012). Metodolohichni zasady pobudovy pedahohichnoi teorii. *Profesiina osvita: pedahohika i psykholohiia: ukrainsko-polskyi shchorichnyk*, 14, 37-50.
- Kremen, V., Tkachenko V. (1998). *Ukraina: shliakh do sebe: problemy suspilnoi transformatsii*. Kyiv: Dr. Ukr.
- Mazur, P. (2017). Personalistic management in education. In: B. Tiganoaia, A. Pavlicek (ed.), *System approaches'17. Can the system approach be useful in solving current problems of modern technologies?* (p. 79-83), Prague, doi: 10.18267/pr.2017.pav.2247.0-12.
- Mazur, P. Miterka, E. (2012). Formation of the new challenge of modern pedagogy of human education. In: B. Akimjaková et al. (ed.), *Antropology in Special and Therapeutical Pedagogy* (p. 47-52), Fribourg.
- Monten, M. (1991). *Opyityi*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Novykov, A. (2005). *Metodologiya uchebnoy deyatel'nosti*. Moskva. Pedahohichna maisternist (1997). Kyiv: Vyscha shk.

- Pestalozzi, J. (1981). *Izbrannyye pedagogicheskie sochineniya*. Moskva: Pedagogika.
- Platon (1996). *Dialogi*. Moskva: Myisl.
- Schedrovitskiy, G. P. (1993). *Sistema pedagogicheskikh issledovaniy (metodologicheskiiy analiz)*. Pedagogika i logika. Moskva: Kistal.
- Scheler, M. (1994). *Izbrannyye proizvedeniya*. Moskva: Gnozis.
- Serikov, G. N. (2006). *Pedagogika*. Moskva: Gumanitar.
- Slovar inostrannyih slov (1988). Moskva: Rus. yaz.
- Sychyvytsia, O. (2001). *Metodolohiia ta filosofiiia*. In: M. A. Skrypnyk, Z. E. Skrypnyk (ed.), *Predmet i problematyka filosofii* (p. 291-315), Lviv: Lviv. bank. Instytut Natsionalnoho banku Ukrainy.
- Ushinskiy, K. (2004). *Chelovek kak predmet vospitaniya: Opyit pedagogicheskoy antropologii*. Moskva: FAIR-PRESS.
- Vasianovych, H. P. (2015). *Metodolohichni konteksty pedahohichnoi nauky na suchasnomu etapi yii rozvytku*. In: *Vybrani tvory*, vol. 7 (p. 164-186), Lviv: Norma.
- Zagvyazinskiy, V. I. (2006). *Metodologiya i metody psihologo-pedagogicheskogo issledovaniya*. Moskva: Izd. tsentr Akademiya.
- Zyazyun, I. A. (2004). *Filosofiiia pedahohichnoho svitohliadu*. In: *Profesiina osvita: pedahohika i psykholohiia ukrainsko-polskyi, polsko-ukrainskyi zhurnal*, 6, 209-231.