
© L. E. PANKRATOVA

Cand. Philosoph.Sci., Associate professor, Department of social work,
Russian State professional and pedagogical University

l.pancratowa2011@yandex.ru

UDC 37.012.1

THE QUESTION OF EDUCATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGY FORMATION

SUMMARY. The purpose of this paper is the analysis of the main stages in the development of educational anthropology. The XX century was called “the age of a child”. This is due to the re-interpretation of the role and place of a child in culture and society. The child is as a subject of law, as a personality, as an object of education and socialization — this is a range of a theoretical interest in various spheres. Educational anthropology may be as a research field, representing a synthesis of different approaches to the phenomenon of a child and childhood. N.I. Pirogov, K.D. Ushinsky, L.N. Tolstoy, P.F. Lesgaft, A.P. Nechayev and other prominent Russian teachers and psychologists played a significant role in its formation. It is necessary to note a contribution of the German philosophers and teachers, such as O.F. Bolnov, G. Rot, G. Nol, etc. Today we can speak about the formation of educational anthropology as a science; about its system and interdisciplinary nature. Although the range of issues, concepts and methods of this science has not been well defined yet, no doubt, it has a theoretical and practical significance.

KEY WORDS. Educational anthropology, anthropology, child, pedagogics.

The theoretical consideration of human problems within the modern social-humanitarian paradigm defined the need for such a science as educational anthropology. Many outstanding scholars believed a human to be the main subject of philosophy and pedagogy. However, different theoretical systems treated the concept of a man differently. The anthropological bent of the systems was often only declarative, while in practice the priority was given to the society, public interests, and the collective. The child was also not seen as a rightful and equal representative of the mankind. The child and the phenomenon of childhood got in the scientific spotlight not so long ago. It is interesting that the first animals’ rights laws appeared in Great Britain in the early XIX century, while the International Convention on children rights was signed only in 1989, almost at the end of the XX century. That is why that century was called “the age of child.” The child, as a rights-holder and a personality, became an object of theoretical consideration in different sciences. At the moment such issues as the introduction of juvenile justice, children rights in the modern society, international adoption of orphans, spiritual and moral education of modern children are being considered. Therefore, the separation of educational anthropology from the general anthropology becomes logical.

Modern educational anthropology is meant to investigate the problems of a child, seen as the object and subject of education, as well as to study a person of any age in the educational process. The specific psychological and age peculiarities of a child are considered; moreover, the child is examined as an individual and a personality in the typical human manifestations. It makes possible to distinguish several basic approaches to educational anthropology. Educational anthropology can be defined as 1) independent integrative science, summarizing knowledge about a person in the process of education; 2) holistic and systematic knowledge about a person in the process of education, where pedagogy is an integral part of the system; 3) a branch of pedagogy; the methodological core of the pedagogical sciences studying child as an integral concept; 4) a branch of humanitarian knowledge that has originated and been developed in Germany, Austria, Switzerland; 5) a separate academic discipline; 6) a special area of academic research [1]. The German tradition also includes two main poles in the understanding of educational anthropology: 1) educational anthropology is an empirical science, seen as a method of studying educational problems; 2) it is a large-scale science synthesizing the data from other human sciences.

There is no unified, generally accepted viewpoint on educational anthropology. So, this branch of knowledge is in the process of formation. In general, educational anthropology examines a person in the process of education; meanwhile education is seen as a fundamental phenomenon of human existence. But as far as the formation of a person begins in childhood, the emphasis is made on a child in the process of education. Educational anthropology synthesizes and summarizes the data of other human and child sciences; therefore, it has the status of systematic complex knowledge and is an interdisciplinary branch of knowledge. At the moment a considerable differentiation of human sciences is going on. Therefore, there is a need to integrate various approaches to find a certain methodological core that would synthesize philosophical, scientific, social-cultural and educational models of interpreting man's nature. Educational anthropology becomes such a core, generalizing data of different areas of human sciences, particularly of those studying child in the aspect of education. Using comprehensive approach, this branch of knowledge accumulates different scientific perspectives of a human. This is how an integrative function of educational anthropology is being realized.

The first development stage of educational anthropology in Russia is connected with the XIX century. In 1856 N.I. Pirogov's article "Life Issues" appeared in the journal "Russkoe Prosveshchenie". According to the article, man underlies the essence of education. However, philosophy, meant to explain the human nature, has turned man into some "abstract" concept. Such an approach is similar to the one proclaimed by the representatives of philosophy of life. N.I. Pirogov believed that unless a person questioned his\her own essence and the meaning of life, the society would manipulate him\her. The real educational practice should contribute to the development of a reflexive position. According to K.D. Ushinsky, N.I. Pirogov was the first scholar to considered education from a philosophical point of view.

However, the term “educational anthropology” was first coined in 1868 by K.D. Ushinsky in the research “Man as the Subject of Education. Educational Anthropology Experience”. In the 1860s the pedagogical science wasn’t well developed. K.D. Ushinsky believed that it was life, not science, that defined educational goals. An educator has to deal with life that does not fit into any theory. This is the general principle of the philosophy of life as well. Education should be determined by practical life, conditions of mental and physical human nature. “If pedagogy wants to educate man in all respects, it has to study him/her inside out in the first place,” K. Ushinsky wrote [2, p.15]. The data of other human sciences and special knowledge is necessary; educational anthropology, being a frontier discipline, can provide it. Psychology and physiology are the main sciences here; they comprise the core of educational anthropology.

According to K.D. Ushinsky, the purpose of education is an all-round development of a person. K. Ushinsky defined pedagogy not as a science, but as an art based on science. All the anthropological sciences should serve educational anthropology: anatomy, physiology, pathology, psychology, logic, geography, philology, statistics, history, philosophy; as far as they study the facts about man, the subject of education.

Thus, K.D. Ushinsky’s work “Man as the Subject of Education. Educational Anthropology Experience” was the first attempt to create an integral human science. At this development stage, pedagogical anthropology was aimed to make a critical review of the previous experience to study the issue of man.

After K.D. Ushinsky’s death educational anthropology was not further developed as an independent branch of knowledge. But, the objectives defined by K.D. Ushinsky were realized by pedagogy within the anthropological approach that correlated education with knowledge of human nature. The researches of many Russian educators had an anthropological slant.

A real “educational boom” took place in Russia in the late XIX – early XX century. A number of scientific pedagogical schools emerged; some of them were anthropological. B.M. Bim-Bud outlined the main tendencies in this process: 1) the natural-science schools based on mechanical and biological understanding of man; 2) the “experimenters” who defined the concept of man as a being spontaneously developing in the course of acquiring experience (L. N. Tolstoy); 3) the sociological schools emphasizing the fact that man descends from the society; 4) the theological school considering man in the image and likeness of God; 5) the synthetic-anthropological school; its representatives, P.F. Lesgaft, P.F. Kapterev, tried to consider man as an integral being [3].

L.N. Tolstoy’s religious and philosophical ideas and his “pedagogy of free education” was also based on a specific approach to man. L. N. Tolstoy did not use the term “educational anthropology”, but anyway, it was included in his doctrine. He accepted the idea about man’s dual nature: animal (corporal) on the one hand, and rational (spiritual) on the other. As a corporal being a man is not free; having satisfied one need, one immediately wants to satisfy another, and so on, i.e. one got captured by own corporal needs. Man is free only in spirit, this free will is granted by God. If

man is free, pedagogy must be free as well. Freely and consciously, man obeys God's will and commandments, longs for self-improvement. Therefore, education can be only religious just because it makes life meaningful. L.N. Tolstoy defined education as an unconscious mastering of certain norms and rules by a child; as the main kind of pedagogical activity. The core of educational process is the change of adults' lifestyle, their joining religious experience. Thus, L.N. Tolstoy's pedagogy of free education was based on understanding man as a free and spiritual being observing all ethical rules of Christianity. The idea of free education, though without any religious slant, was further developed by K.V. Venttsel.

F. Lesgaft also realized the anthropological approach in pedagogy. In his work "Anthropology and Pedagogy" (1889), he determined an all-round development of a human body as a general objective of education and upbringing. He believed, anthropology must be the main pillar of pedagogy. Otherwise, pedagogy will never become a science, and will only exist as the history of pedagogical methods. Only anthropology can guarantee an integral understanding of man, his physical and mental development. In the research "Family Education of a Child and its Value", P.F. Lesgaft distinguished certain anthropological types: hypocritical, ambitious, good-natured, etc. Family education influenced the formation of these types greatly. According to P.F. Lesgaft, normal type of a pupil is formed when in a family a child is surrounded with love and joy; when a mother is an example of morality, when there is a harmony between intellectual and physical development.

Anthropological ideas were also developed by P.F. Kapterev, V.P. Vakhterov, and K.N. Venttsel. All of them understood man as a self-developing organism. Creativity, striving for development and growth are innate in a child. The principles of a child development should be studied comprehensively by means of medicine, biology, anthropology, psychology, etc. The purpose of education is to develop a harmonious personality, taking into account all the specific features; and an educator has to encourage this development, get rid of all the adverse factors.

The further development of educational anthropology in Russia in the early XX century is connected with the formation of pedology (from Greek "science about children"). Pedology combines the knowledge of all other sciences about children; it appeared in 1894 in America. O. Hrisman, a follower of a well-known American psychologist S. Holl, coined the term, and published the first journal "Pedology" in the USA in 1894. The integral study of the children of all age groups created prerequisites for the anthropological base of pedagogy. A.P. Nechayev is considered to be the founder of pedology in Russia. In 1901 in St. Petersburg he opened a pedological laboratory named after K.D. Ushinsky. Pedology became widespread after the October revolution. Pedological institutes and laboratories, studying different aspects of child life, were founded. "The Pedological Journal" began to be published. Pedology is associated with the names of P.P. Blonsky, L.S. Vygotsky, M. M. Rubenstein, V.P. Kashchenko, A.R. Luriya, and A.B. Zalkind. According to P.P. Blonsky, pedology is a science about age development of the child in certain social-historical environment. He wrote that a child in his/her development goes through all the basic biological and cultural - historical stages of human evolution.

Despite certain progress in the creation of an integral science about the child, in the early 30th of the XX century the destruction of pedology began. Sticking to K.D. Ushinsky's main ideas, pedology advocated an individual approach to education; this went counter to the interests of the totalitarian society that tend to level everyone down. Pedology was banned in 1936 by the resolution of the Central Committee of All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) "Pedological perversions in the system of People's Commissariat". Pedology got split into separate sciences: age psychology, age physiology and educational psychology [4].

The first attempt to revive educational anthropology in our country was undertaken by an outstanding psychologist B.G. Ananyev in 1970s. He published an article "About Man as the Subject and Object of Education" where he used K.D. Ushinsky's main ideas to raise a question of creating a special scientific discipline about man. However, B.G. Ananyev's ideas began to be implemented only in 1990s. Such scholars as D.B. Elkonin, V. V. Davydov, V.A. Sukhomlinsky used main ideas of educational anthropology about the necessity to study man for his upbringing. Guided by L.N. Tolstoy's pedagogy of free education, Sh.A. Amonashvili, I.P. Volkov, E.N. Ilyin, V.A. Karakovsky, S.N. Lysenkova, V.F. Shatalov, and M.P. Shchetinin formed a new school in Russian pedagogy in 1980s. It became known as "pedagogy of cooperation". The ideas of respectful attitude and studying child personality, as well as new, coercion-free, relations with learners and involving them into joint creative interaction, underlied this pedagogy.

In fact, in the XX century educational anthropology was mainly developed in Germany. Probably, German educators tried to understand the ideological sources of fascism in their country. In 1983 a book "Anthropological Pedagogy" by Otto Friedrich Bolnov, G. Plesner's follower and an adherent of philosophy of life, was published. According to it, life and human existence are inexhaustible and immeasurable. Man is also inexhaustible and "open" for infinite interpretations. Education is not just a purposeful activity, but the quality initially inherent in the human existence. Man has a deep-rooted need to be a tutor and a learner. O.T. Bolnov was the first to analyze such unstable forms of human life as crisis, risk, meeting, advice, awakening, failure and their educational opportunities. Crisis is especially significant for education; it breaks a habitual lifestyle, and makes a person review his\her life and open the new horizons. A tutor should show to a learner the prospects of innovation and develop his\her critical thinking. Criticism is an essential individuality feature, that allows to develop one's own judgments and, therefore, avoid being manipulated by the society. Probably, German citizens had lacked criticism and inner-directedness; that is why they had readily believed Nazi "good intentions". The central category of O.T. Bolnov's anthropological pedagogy is the category of meeting. Meeting is a specific manifestation of crisis. It is a sharp, unexpected change in the inner world of a human after the clash with another spirit. Meeting is a discovery of something significant by a learner during his\her interaction with a teacher or tutor. Education is a learner and a teacher's meeting. The concept of meeting is similar to the concept of dialogue in M. Buber's philosophy. O.F. Bolnov considered that trust to the world is the prerequisite of human life. It is such a state of mind when one feels protected and

secure. Without it, education is impossible. In order to make a child feel safe and trust the world, it is necessary to create the pedagogical environment – one more concept of O.F. Bolnov's anthropological pedagogy. The pedagogical environment is a set of emotional conditions which emerge during teacher-learner interaction and serve as the background of educational influence. A teacher should maintain joyful mood, otherwise pedagogical environment will never appear.

The term educational anthropology emphasized regularities of the educational process and was organically included in the problem field of modern pedagogy.

In Germany G. Nol, G. Roth, G. Depp-Forvald, Y. Derbolav, Y. Blas, V. Lokh, K. Dinlt, E. Fink, etc. were the ones who dealt with the issues of educational anthropology. In the 70th the critical tendency in educational anthropology was developed. Y. Blas considered the existing definitions of man to be too broad and ambiguous. It complicated teachers' work. Educational anthropology didn't have its own subject field; it was not a separate discipline, but the core of general pedagogy. Educational anthropology should exist as an empirical science that provides pedagogy with methods and ways to research educational issues (the empirical direction).

G. Roth considered educational anthropology to be an integrative empirical science. He believed man to be dependent on self-interpretation, i.e. on upbringing and education. Educational anthropology is an integrative science because it collects and researches the data of other human sciences. These data is collected for teachers; therefore it is an empirical science. Educational anthropology investigates man through the prism of possibility and necessity of education; it studies values and norms in their significance for education; investigates the means to make man change in a certain social direction [5, 6].

In an attempt to understand man in the process of upbringing and education, classical anthropology tried to find human essence, while non-classical anthropology (and educational anthropology as well) rely mostly on post-modern understanding of man. Man is not an abstract and anonymous subject, but a definite personality or person (M. Foucault). Person can not be reduced to a number of some features and qualities. G. Plesner believed that even if everything seems to be known and said about man, all this knowledge is just approximate and incomplete and far from being absolute truth. G. Nol in his «Pedagogical Humanities» claims that one can only understand human nature if approaching it from different angles. Post-modernists believe man to be indefinable and open for interpretations. Man does not possess any definable essence or stable nature. There are different human projects, they are not fixed, but designed through cultural practices. Spontaneity is the main value and basic characteristic of a person. According to the representatives of this school, modern education and upbringing are totalitarian, because they are aimed at depersonalization. They tend to make people think, speak, act similarly “correctly”; they suppress human spontaneity. Within such an approach pedagogy becomes a form of the terror against a person. While existing form of education and upbringing is hostile to children. There is a need for free and open education that would promote the cultivation of human spontaneity [7].

In conclusion it should be noted that educational anthropology was founded in the XIX century due to K.D. Ushinsky. It went through a long and difficult period of

formation. From the very beginning it considered the child from anthropological positions, as a representative of mankind, while the adult was seen as the subject, constantly in the situation of education and upbringing. But today, in the XXI century, the range of problems, concepts and methods of educational anthropology has not yet been clearly outlined. However, undoubtedly, such a science is necessary and it fits the general tendency of humanization of modern pedagogy. Still developing today, educational anthropology tries to find its own subject field [8-11]. There are two mutually complementary, historically developed traditions in understanding educational anthropology. The first lays emphasis on a person in the process of education and upbringing, while the second considers the child from anthropological positions in the same context. This science can form the base for a new interpretation of a person's role in the culture, his value and implementation of new pedagogical technologies.

REFERENCES

1. Il'jashenko, E.G. *Pedagogicheskaja antropologija v Rossii: Istorija i sovremennost'* [Educational Anthropology in Russia: Past and Present]. Moscow: URAO Publ., 2003. 130 p. (in Russian).
2. Ushinskij, K.D. *Pedagogicheskie sochinenija: V 6 t.* [Pedagogical works: in 6 vols]. Vol. 5-6. Moscow, 1990. 528 p. (in Russian).
3. *Pedagogicheskaja antropologija: Uchebnoe posobie* [Educational Anthropology: Textbook] / Ed. by B.M. Bim-Bada. Moscow, 1998. 576 p. (in Russian).
4. Il'jashenko, E.G. Russian pedology in the context of the development of educational anthropology (the first third of the XX century) [Otechestvennaja pedologija v kontekste razvitiya pedagogicheskaj antropologii (pervaja tret' XX v.)]. *Trudy kafedry pedagogiki, istorii obrazovanija i pedagogicheskaj antropologii, vyp. 17* (Works of the department of pedagogics, history of education and educational anthropology, Issue 17). Moscow, 2002. Pp. 59-76. (in Russian).
5. Kulikov, V.B. *Pedagogicheskaja antropologija: istoki, napravlenija, problemy* [Educational Anthropology: sources, trends and problems]. Sverdlovsk: Ural State University Publ., 1988. 192 p. (in Russian).
6. Emel'janov, B.V. Petrunina, T.A. *Očerki pedagogicheskaj antropologii v Rossii* [Sketches of educational anthropology in Russia]. Ekaterinburg, 1997. 229 p. (in Russian).
7. Ogurcov, A.P. Post-modern image of a man and pedagogy. *Chelovek — Man*. 2001. № 3-4. Pp. 16-25. (in Russian).
8. Il'jashenko, E.G. The development of anthropological and pedagogical ideas in Russia in the 60-90 years of the XIX century *Razvitie antropologo-pedagogicheskij idej v Rossii v 60-90 gody XIX veka. Trudy kafedry pedagogiki, istorii obrazovanija i pedagogicheskaj antropologii, vyp. 16.* (Works of the department of pedagogy, history of education and educational anthropology, Issue 16). Moscow, 2002. Pp. 27-45. (in Russian).
9. Maksakova, V.I. *Pedagogicheskaja antropologija: ucheb. posobie dlja studentov vysshij ped. ucheb. zavedenij* [Educational anthropology: Textbook for students of higher ped. institutions]. Moscow: Academia, 2004. 205 p. (in Russian).
10. Ogurcov, A.P. Educational Anthropology: search and prospects. *Chelovek — Man*. 2002. № 2. Pp. 100-117. (in Russian).
11. Pankratova, L.Je. *Pedagogicheskaja antropologija: ucheb. posobie* [Educational anthropology: Textbook]. Ekaterinburg, Ural State Pedagogical University publ., 2007. 123 p. (in Russian).