

Elena Viktorovna Berezhnova¹
MGIMO University, Moscow
Philosophy Department

Original scientific paper
UDC: 37.022

=====

CULTURE OF A PEDAGOGUE – RESEARCHER

Abstract: The author of the paper starts from the difference delineating a pedagogue – practitioner and a pedagogue – researcher pointing both to the features getting them closer and to those significantly separating them and manifesting in the process of scientific work realization. Special attention is paid to the issues of humanism, humanistic culture, norms and ideals of knowledge, values determining the work of a scientist, and finally to the question of freedom reflecting the essence of scientist's existence.

Key words: pedagogue – practitioner, pedagogue – researcher, humanistic culture, norms and ideals of knowledge, freedom.

It is well known that the culture acts as a special subsystem of the society, but it runs through absolutely all aspects of social life, and there are no social phenomena that are isolated from the effects of the culture or that are not affected by it.

Speaking of any type of culture is always difficult, as it starts with definition of the term “culture”, which is one of the key problems of the contemporary humanitarian knowledge. Currently this term has several hundreds definitions, which makes the discussion considerably more difficult. Without fixing on the analysis of definitions of culture, let us turn to the main milestones of understanding of culture that V.S. Stepin consequently identifies in history.

The first milestone is understanding of culture as anything created by man. It was opposed by another definition: culture is natural. *The second* milestone was related to setting the problem of balance between culture and activity, as anything created by man is the product of his activity. In this context, the understanding of culture as a means to regulate the activity gradually emerged. *The third* milestone was marked by that the culture was interpreted as a complex system of suprabiological programs of human activity. These programs were represented by the variety of knowledge, directions, norms, skills, ideals, activity and behavior samples, ideas, beliefs, objectives, system of values, etc. [3, p. 90].

It should be noted that in the aggregate in historical development such programs form the accumulating and continuously developing social experience, which outlines the basic shapes of the system of contemporary understanding (overview) of culture.

¹ lina164@yandex.ru <lina164@yandex.ru>

In the framework of the common culture, we may distinguish the culture of teaching. It may be inherent in the society (teaching culture of the society) and in the people bringing their children (teaching culture of parents), but we are more interested in teaching culture of professionals. One vocabulary gives the following definition: “Professional is a man who chose some kind of activity as his profession; a specialist in something” (Rozin 2005: 498).

Professional teaching culture consists of many components (e.g. didactic culture, communicative culture, aesthetic culture, intellectual culture and others), one of which is methodological culture. It is the methodological culture, in our opinion, that should be paid special attention, as it is a system-forming component of professional culture, which allows more complete application of its other components, which results in teaching creativity.

The methodological culture of practicing teacher and researching teacher shall be distinguished. The main distinguishing characteristic here is the fact that researching teacher produces pedagogic knowledge, and the practicing teacher uses it (see Berezhnova & Kraevsky, 2012 for details). It should be mentioned, though, that sometimes teachers are involved in the scientific research, but it is not compulsory for them and only a small group is involved in it. Many researching teachers are also the lecturers in universities. Their activity is more extensive than that of the teachers, as at is both carried out in theoretical (research) and practical form.

In addition to the differences, there are also common characteristics inherent in both types of activity. The common thing for the practicing teacher and for the researching teacher is the resolution of intellectual problems in the area of pedagogy. In order to resolve such problems, both need the same skills, such as:

- seeing the problem and applying actual materials to its resolution;
- expressing the problem within a specific pedagogic objective;
- suggesting a hypothesis and performing an imaginable experiment: “what would happen if...”;
- clearly seeing several possible ways to resolve the problem and conceptually selecting the optimal one;
- dividing the resolution into “steps” in certain sequence;
- analyzing the process and outcomes of resolution of the problem.

Developing the skills a practicing teacher and researching teacher need will not only assist the former in improvement of effectiveness of his practical activity, but will also serve in future as a basis that will allow (if wilful and duly trained) to carry out theoretical (research) activity in the area of pedagogy.

There is a concept in psychology that subconscious research in the form of spontaneous reaction to the problematic situation of research activity is inherent in any person. Sporadic research runs through the entire life of a person, irrespective of his abilities and social status, being the means of understanding the reality and interacting with it. Research is basic, universal approach to understanding and learning the surrounding

world, other people, oneself. Researching behaviour displays spontaneously; its start is mainly caused by outside stimuli (Obukhov, 2006).

It should be noted that we view the research activity as a specially organized activity carried out in accordance with cultural standards. Successful activity of the researching teacher mainly depends on his position, in which the culture reflects in the form of system of values.

The main vector of evolution of scientific learning passing to the post-non-classical stage of its development, in psychology is corresponded by the attention to individual and other sciences about the human, mainly anthropology, moving away from strict rational, logical, formalized schemes. There is a need to develop humanitarian aspects of pedagogy methodology, and the top priority in resolution of the problems of pedagogic science is the position of the researching teacher (see Berezhnova, 2008 for details on definition).

In this respect, the priority becomes the system of values of the subject of research – the scientist. The values are the elements of his overall and methodological culture, and can be identified at different stages of scientific effort.

Thus, during the design stage, the main components of research are being identified, which include problem and topic. Selection of a problem from many others, substantiation of urgency of a topic are identified along with objectively existing scientific problems and practical objectives, as well as life events, scientific facts, which are personally important for the researcher and which are the part of his personal culture.

At the stage of performance of scientific research, the culture of the researcher is seen in:

- methods of description of pedagogic situations and their evaluation;
- building theoretical model of the subject, i.e. in identifying the main, most important components; identifying the ideals, achievement of which is preferable;
- selection of scientific paradigms and research traditions, in the framework of which the scientific activity will be carried out;
- nature of transition from the subject of research to its transformation;
- building of the reference model of subject, identification of steps to achieve certain ideals;
- substantiation of the reference model, which can be achieved by various approaches.

At the stage of receipt of a new knowledge, the emotional and value component of the researcher's culture can be mainly seen in responsibility of its use in pedagogic practice.

Hence there is a question: what values and liaisons between them form the position of the researching teacher? Not claiming to form the complete list of values, let us suggest a brief overview of the main of them, which, in our opinion, for the system and may become the basis for further research in the context of contemporary methods of scientific learning in the educational sphere.

Humanism. Substantiating this value, V.M. Rozin writes: "... it is not only important what humanitarian knowledge says, but also where it leads us, whether the events and reality emerge for us, and which ones, whether the author frees the room for our life, development, growth, assists us in it." The author stipulates the supplemental nature of awareness of personal life of the researcher in the context of good humanitarian learning: "It is in the context of personal life where the scientific knowledge acts as humanitarian knowledge" (Rozin 2005: 72).

Humanitarian culture. Humanitarian person does not apply scientific and engineering conditionality and causality to the life of a man and society, as he understands the spiritual nature of these ideas, which can not be approached as a technical culture. "For him all of these are live subjects, they should be understood, heard, talked to (this is where the role of language applies), but they should not be manipulated, turned into means" (Rozin 2005: 73).

This is particularly urgent today, when there are many aggressive, dangerous technologies of manipulating a person. These are not only the technologies brought up by the natural science, but also social and humanitarian technologies. The number of such technologies constantly increases, they become the threats for existence, for liberty of a man. The role of culture in this process can be expressed in simple words: why culture? So that the man could survive and help others to survive.

Standards and ideals of learning. At different stages of development of science, the research is performed in a certain ways compliant with the characteristics of such stage. L.A. Mikeshina notes that "it is the ideals and standards that determine the sample theories, methods, facts, validity, reasonableness of knowledge for the scientists, as well as the methods of organization of knowledge and activity" (Mikeshina 2007: 165). Standards and ideals get institutionalized and further broadcasted in the learning activity through the means of communications and due to them.

Current changing of the ideal of value-neutral research of complex subjects a man is involved in is an important step in development of science. It does not result in cancellation of the previous standards of learning, but requires their specification with respect to the system of values of the scientist. It is important that such changes and specifications become the personal asset of new scientists.

Values of scientific community. Commonly recognized and standardized standards and rules of scientific activity, form and nature of relationships within the professional team (paradigm, scientific research program, samples, traditions, means of communications, behavioural standards within the community).

Scientist's values. Affective relation seen in interests, attitude, preferences. It is conditioned by the world outlook, ethics, aesthetics of a certain historical age, science paradigm dominating during such age, which affects the selection of methodological standards. At the same time it should be remembered that variability of the listed

circumstances is limited by the invariability of the set of values accumulated by humanity in its strenuous ascent to the peaks of culture.

Freedom. The discussion of the subject can not be reduced to its psychological characteristics. It is important that a subject in the process of research can demonstrate further properties – values and freedoms: “Values, while existing independently from their implementation/non-implementation, do not force a subject, but put the requirements and leave the freedom of action and “moment of freedom and moment of bearing moral values”, where the background is the “necessity of ideal existence of values” form the uniform basis of an individual” (Mikeshina 2007: 78).

It is the last statement that forms the essence of transition of objectively existing values to the form of subjective relation, which represents the position of researching scientist. This position is integral, and hence it defines the consistency of behavior of the scientist in science and life, if such values are accepted by him freely, informally and they do not fluctuate as being affected by outside effects. This idea can be put more briefly: if his free choice is moral. Rhetoric concerning the moral and humanism without supporting it by one’s own behavior worth nothing. Thus, the “core’s core” of the position of a scientist is ultimately what I. Kant called the “moral law within” and directly connected it with the consciousness of his existence.

Thus, system of values of a scientist – as an aspect of his culture – is characterized by the uniformity of moral, professional and civil position and act as objective and subjective condition of his consistency in all spheres of life.

Bibliography:

- Berezhnova, E.V. & Kraevsky, V.V. (2012). *Основы учебно-исследовательской деятельности студентов: Учебник для студ. сред. пед. учеб. заведений [Fundamentals of research activity of students: Textbook for students of higher pedagogic educational institutions]* (7th Ed.), Moscow, Publ. center «Academia».
- Berezhnova, E. V. (2008). *Позиция педагога-ученого и ее отражение в понятийно-терминологическом аппарате педагогики // Язык педагогики в контексте современного научного знания: Материалы Всероссийского методологического семинара. [Position of the researching teacher and its representation in conceptual and terminological apparatus of pedagogy // Language of pedagogy in the context of contemporary scientific knowledge: Materials of Russian National Methodological Seminar]*, Ed. By Kraevsky, V.V., Volgograd – Krasnodar – Moscow. KubGU.
- http://www.lihachev.ru/pic/site/files/fulltext/kulturologija_kak_nauka_vf_2008.pdf (2009). *Культурология как наука: за и против: круглый стол. [Culturology as a science: pros and cons: round table discussion]*, (University Discussion Club, 18th Ed.). Saint-Petersburg: SPbGUP publishing house.
- Mikeshina, L.A. (2007). *Эпистемология ценностей [Epistemology of values]*. Sankt_Peterbutg: Rossijskaya politicheskaya encyclopediya.
- Obukhov, A. S. (2006). *От спонтанного к осознанному любопытству: становление субъектности в исследовательской деятельности [From spontaneous to conscious curiosity: establishment of subjectivity in the research activity]*, Link available at:
- http://www.issl.redu.ru/archive/2006/presentations/other/obuhov_plenarnoe.ppt

- Rozin, V. M. (2005). Природа и особенности гуманитарного познания и науки [Nature and peculiarities of humanitarian learning and science]. In V.A. Lektorsky, V. A. (ed.). *Наука глазами гуманитария* [Science as viewed by scholar]. Moscow: «Наука».
- Landa, N. M., Smyslov, D. V., Apresyan, R. G., Chornyj, K. M. (1993). *Современный словарь иностранных слов* [Contemporary dictionary of foreign terms]. Moscow: «Russkij jazyk».

Biographical note

Elena Viktorovna Berezhnova studied pedagogy and obtained a doctor degree in 2003, having defended her thesis “Methodological conditions of the shift from science to practice of pedagogical sciences; structure of applied pedagogic research”. She is a senior associate of the Institute for theory of education and pedagogy RAO, senior associate of the Centre for innovation models in education (2010), as well as a professor at philosophy department at MGIMO University, Moscow. She teaches *Pedagogic Research Methodology* and *Methodology Culture of Teachers*.