Vasyl Haluziak *[wgaluz@gmail.com]*

Department of Pedagogy and Professional Education at Vinnytsia State Pedagogical University named after Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi (Ukraine, Vinnytsia)

Iryna Kholkovska *[irholk@gmail.com]*

Department of Pedagogy and Professional Education at Vinnytsia State Pedagogical University named after Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi (Ukraine, Vinnytsia),

Upbringing – the Purposeful Forming or Assistance in the Self-development of a Personality

Abstract: In modern theory of upbringing there are different approaches to the understanding of essence and meaning of this phenomenon in the development of a personality. Recently in psychology and pedagogics various attempts have been made to comparatively analyze and classify different concepts of upbringing. They all are determined by the objective necessity to systemize pedagogical ideas about ways and methods of the organization of upbringing, by the necessity of creation of the specific coordinate system which would help to be oriented in the variety of educational systems and concepts of the past and the present. Existence of different conceptions of upbringing as a rule is determined by distinctions in basic ideas about the nature of a child (man). In the context of European cultural tradition it is possible to distinguish two opposite ways of understanding the nature of people: pessimistic and

optimistic. The first one consists of mistrust to people, perception of them as asocial and destructive. The opposite one consists of optimistic perception of people, faith in their undoubtedly-positive and good structural beginning. In accordance to the basic setting connected with the essence of a person, the following questions should be answered: "What should be done with this essence to make a person better?" and "How a person should be brought up?"

Key words: upbringing, concepts of upbringing, nature of people, forming, manipulation, facilitation.

Plenty of various theories and models of upbringing based on different methodological principles and which make an accent on different aspects of pedagogical interaction are presented in modern psychology and pedagogics. The spectrum of approaches to the understanding of essence and value of upbringing is sufficiently wide: from its interpretation as purposeful process of forming a personality by a certain standard to giving to it auxiliary role in self-actualization or complete denial of right to its existence. There is an objective necessity in systematization of pedagogical ideas about the ways and methods of organization of education, creation of the original coordinate system that would give an opportunity to be oriented in the variety of educating systems and conceptions of the past and present.

Pedagogical Paradigms and Models

Recently various types of models of upbringing based on different grounds and which make accents on different aspects of educating process (Sh. Amonashvili, G. Ball, Y. Yamburg, G. Kornetov, R. Kwasnica and other) have been created in pedagogics. So, for example, Sh. Amonashvili distinguishes two diametrically opposite conceptions of upbringing: authoritarian-imperative and humanistic [Amonashvili 1995]. The first is based on persuasion about impossibility of upbringing without coercion, as from the very beginning a child has an asocial orientation and requires permanent control, su-

pervision, limitation of natural activity, and is enforced to responsibility and moral behavior. According to such approach upbringing takes the shape of open forming influence of a teacher, oriented in one direction – on a pupil. Activity of a child becomes fully controlled by adults' requirements that, stimulating, directing or braking, solve set educational tasks. Authoritarian-imperative upbringing aims to subordinate life of a child to the educator, as only by means of such methods with the help of which a child can be prepared for future valuable, "real" adult life. Sh. Amonashvili considers that as a consequence, education becomes isolated from life of children, their real interests and that is why it causes resistance and non-acceptance.

As a positive alternative to the authoritarian-imperative model of upbringing Sh. Amonashvili describes humanistic conception of cooperation, according to which upbringing is directed at realization of natural skills of a child, his or her striving for development, freedom and maturing. A teacher must not ignore actual states and necessities of a child, but vice versa, must fully coordinate education with a child's own intentions and inclinations. Humanistic conception of upbringing orients a teacher to make a child an equal participant, coauthor of own education and encourages a child to think in the same way.

Sh. Amonashvili contrasts both conceptions of upbringing sharply, marking at unproductiveness and even antihumanistic of authoritarian-imperative approach. Analyzing his position, it should be taken into account that burning discussions took place in the end of the 20th century based on 'childlessness' of official soviet pedagogics and authoritarianism of mass school. This exact fact can explain categoricalness and sharp polemic orientation of the author. At the same time G. Kornetov justly notices that "setting a question about the necessity of pedagogical pluralism and criticizing soviet epoch for not carrying alternative variants of theory and practice of upbringing because of deeply idealized division of pedagogics into the 'most high-rank' soviet and 'reactionary' bourgeois, Sh. Amonashvili himself does not give such structural alternative. Both paradigms of upbringing distinguished by the author – humanistic and authoritarian-imperative, in their semantic de-

scriptions are aimed not at the productive dialogue, but on confrontation and exposure" [Kornetov 2001, p. 89].

Y. Yamburg builds the typology of pedagogical paradigms, not contrasting them as "good" and "bad", "correct" and "wrong", but adhering to the principle of complementarity. He distinguishes four pedagogical paradigms that determine strategic aims of education and determine the character of the solution of pedagogical problems: cognitive-informational, competent, personality and cultural [Yamburg 2004].

Cognitive-informational paradigm goes out of ideas about the necessity of transmission to children of maximal volume of the knowledge, abilities and skills accumulated by humanity. Thus a desire and necessities of a child, as a rule, are not taken into account. Competent paradigm makes accents on strengthening of practical orientation and instrumental orientation of education. The primary aim is preparation of an able and mobile person, who owns not a set of facts, but the methods of their receipt and application. Personality paradigm carries accents from intellectual to emotional and social development of a child; it pays much attention to interests and problems of pupils. Its basic value is personal becoming of children, their free, spontaneous, natural development. According to cultural paradigm it is stated that the formation of a child's personality is the primary aim of education, but unlike personal paradigm, it does not fetish free education. Freedom and coercion here are considered the complementary beginning; the complete denial of coercion in education is equated to full denial of culture. The main tasks of education, according to cultural approach, are the transmission of cultural values to next generations and the education of a spiritual man. As sometimes a number of pupils cannot realize the necessity of cultural norms and values, the elements of pedagogical coercion in education are inevitable.

In our opinion, the first two of Y. Yamburg's paradigms are more relevant to the process of education and represent traditional for pedagogics opposition to the theory of formal and material education. Two other paradigms

such as personal and cultural have direct attitude toward upbringing and in general coincide with humanistic and authoritarian approaches.

G. Ball and M. Burgin distinguish two basic strategies of education: monologue and dialogic [Ball, Burgin 1994]. In monologue strategy an educator is considered a competent object and transmitter of truth and a pupil is an object of educative influence. A teacher individually, without a child's opinion determines the aim and tasks of the education. Authors distinguish two types of monologue strategy of education: imperative and manipulative. According to imperative strategy the desirable result of educative influence (for example persuasion of a pupil or an action expected from him) is directly specified or proclaimed by an educator. A pupil's activity must be directed at the realization and implementation of a teacher's orders. In manipulative strategy the aim of educative influence is not proclaimed directly, but is achieved by means of hidden direct activity of pupils in desirable by an educator direction. A pupil's activity can be carried out on different levels – from elementary conventional reflexes to independent difficult activity the conditions of which are organized to attain planned by a teacher result. Unlike monologue strategy in its two variants, dialogic strategy of education disengages itself from divergences in social status of an educator and a pupil and is based on acceptance of fully subjective value and fundamental equality of rights.

A similar approach to differentiation of basic models of education was offered by G. Kornetov [Kornetov 2001, pp. 85–108]. In his opinion, different models of education differ first of all by certain features of determination of educative aims and methods of their realization. Education as purposeful influence on development of a man begins with the determination of aims. It is effective only in case, when cooperation of participants of pedagogical process provides the achievement of the set aims by means of specially chosen facilities. That's why the typology of basic models of education, in G. Kornetov's opinion, first of all must take into account sources and methods of setting educational aims, and also the methods of their achievement. On the basis of the determined criteria the author distinguishes three pedagogical

paradigms (pedagogics of authority, pedagogics of manipulation and pedagogics of support), to each of which certain model of education corresponds to. In the context of the first of them, education is understood as purposeful forming of personality in accordance with certain educational goals. In the second, education is interpreted as manipulation, which is indirect hidden influence on a personality with the purpose of development in this personality's desirable qualities from the point of view of the educator. In the third one education is explained as assistance in self-actualization of a personality, creation of conditions for self-determination and self-realization of a child.

Pedagogics of authority is traditional pedagogics that is based on confession that an educator is a mature experienced person who has the right to individually determine educational aims and the means of their realization. In the context of this model pupils are obliged to implement the requirements of a teacher, to confess his leading role as a man who runs their development and called to solve the important social and educational problem of rising generations. Taking into account the attained level and prospects of social and cultural development of society, a teacher leaning on historical experience, plans and realizes in practice the education and upbringing of his pupils. He determines educational aims, plans desirable changes, designs properties and qualities that must be formed in children as a result of pedagogical co-operation. During the determination of the aim of education first of all social order and requirements of the society must be taken into consideration, though the interests of children are partially taken into account too, if they do not contradict public norms. The basic supposition is that to live full life in society, children must get certain social roles, master certain means of activity and communication, values and norms of behavior, that are created by previous generations. Thus it is considered that a teacher knows better than a child, what kind of a person she or he must become and in what direction they must develop. During the process of education a pupil cannot realize the necessity of that way of development, which is dictated by reasonability of pedagogical expediency.

In pedagogics of authority the cooperation between an educator and a pupil mostly takes the shape of open purposeful influence of the first on the second. An educator is an object that determines the aim and the way of development of a child, and a child is an object that is formed under the supervision and control of a tutor. Thus a teacher does not try by all means to hide the position of the leader. On the contrary, he demonstrates it freely, calling and obligating a pupil to follow him to execute his instructions, and realize pedagogical intentions.

Pedagogics of manipulation considers education as indirect hidden influence of teacher on a pupil with the aim of forming socially desirable qualities and options. In this case manipulation is understood as those widespread in pedagogical practice situations, when an educator by means of indirect influences tries to induce children to certain behavior and form their certain aspirations. He sincerely strives for a pupil's good, but he decides by himself what this good must consist of.

The manipulative model of education gives an opportunity to change pupils, avoiding open pressure and confrontation. Adhering to this model, a teacher does not set a pedagogical aim before pupils obviously, avoids direct, though corresponding to their interests, influences. A pupil becomes simultaneously an object of pedagogical influence, because the aim and facilities of his or her development are designed by an educator, and a subject, because subjectively he operates independently, not realizing that the direction and the conditions of the activity are determined by an educator. A child does not feel any pressure from the side of the teacher, who tries not to demonstrate the leading role in education, but masks it in every possible way. In such a way the problem of inconsistency between educational tasks of a teacher and vital interests of children is solved. Pupils start to develop the ability to live in the conditions of freedom, accept responsible decisions, make an independent vital choice, although this freedom and independence are invisibly programed and controlled by an educator.

G. Kornetov thinks that the manipulative model of education in comparison to authoritarian one creates more favorable conditions for the develop-

ment of activity and independence of a child. At the same time, being pedagogics of 'directed freedom', it gives an educator the function of a leader and organizer of pedagogical process who individually determines the aim of education and facilities of its achievement [Kornetov 2001, pp. 85–108].

A pupil as an equal in rights partner of a teacher is examined in the third form of pedagogical paradigm distinguished by G. Kornetov – the pedagogics of support [Kornetov 2001, pp. 85–108]. Faith in structural, creative beginning of human nature, in its primitive morality and kindness, altruistic orientation, ability independently to elect the correct way of own development are its background. In accordance with the options of pedagogics of support an educator must not lead a child this way and even not to direct the development, but follow a child, support her or his self-realization, help in the solution of own problems. The first task to be solved by an educator is adjusting of emotional contact with a child, productive communication that is based on mutual respect and trust, and in an ideal – on mutual love. The next task is to understand a pupil. Watching a child and communicating with him, a teacher tries delicately and unobtrusively to get to the inner world, find out the necessities and interests, expose potential abilities and to define vital problems of a child. After it a teacher helps a child in self-cognition, comprehension of own interests and possibilities, determination of the tasks of self-development. Thus, a teacher determines the pedagogical aim not on the basis of own ideas what kind of a person a pupil must become, but he takes into account his internal potential and vital experience. Creating conditions for determination of ways of own development of a child, a teacher promotes their realization.

Such model of education almost eliminates the inconsistency of pedagogical aims and actual vital interests of a pupil, because educational tasks are formulated on the basis of vital aims and personal participation of a pupil. Due to it they are perceived not as imposed from outside, but as their own. It prevents the collision of aims and aspirations of participants of educational process. In such case the position of a teacher turns into the position of a sen-

ior friend, adviser and helper and is not hidden from a pupil, because it is the product of their cooperation.

In the second half of the 20th century the ideas of pedagogical support found their reflection in humanistic theories of A. Maslow, C. Rogers, E. Fromm and others. They acquired a radical turn in antipedagogy, the representatives of which encouraged refusal from purposeful education, that, from their perspective, is a form of violence, suppression of personality based on fear and submission of children to somebody else's normative conceptions (E. von Braunmuhl, H. von Schoenebeck, C. Rochefort, H. Kupffer, H. Ostermeyer, K. Rutschky, W. Hinte and others). The basic slogans of antipedagogy are: "non-interference in the internal affairs of children", "freedom for all", "friendship with children". Only this kind of approach, as E. von Braunmuhl states, will enable us to do away with educational war between children and adults [von Braunmuhl 1975]. According to his opinion, there is no point in considering that children are not able to understand what is better for them. The claim of adults – "I know better, what is good and what is bad for you" – reduces a child's responsibility for their own actions. The supporters of antipedagogy adhere to the opposite position: a child is wise from birth as well as sensitive towards what is best for them, they can assume responsibility for their actions and does not require any guidance. This is where the basic imperative of antipedagogy stems from: "to support, but not to educate", to regard an adult as a friend and partner of a child, and relations between them as symmetrical. The adult must play the role of a friend rather than that of an educator, the one who does not dictate or impose anything. His basic function is to accompany the spiritual and physical evolution of children who must do everything only by their own free will. Thus, pedagogy of support in its extreme, the most radical variant denies education as a purposeful influence on a child with the aim of forming their certain qualities and values.

It is not difficult to notice that the pedagogical paradigms singled out G. Kornetov (pedagogy of authority, pedagogy of manipulation and pedagogy of support) generally correspond to the three educational strategies, described

by G. Ball and M. Burgin: pedagogy of authority corresponds to the imperative strategy of education, pedagogy of manipulation is reflected in the manipulative one, pedagogy of support corresponds to the dialogic one. Within the framework of each paradigm the phenomenon of upbringing acquires specific meaning. In pedagogy of authority upbringing is interpreted as purposeful formation of personality in accordance with the aims, set, openly and single-handedly realized by the educator through direct educational influences. In pedagogics of manipulation educational tasks are also determined by an educator, are, however, realized in a hidden manner by means of indirect influences, corresponding organization of subject and social surroundings of children. Finally, in pedagogics of support the developmental tasks are determined by a pupil, rather than by the educator who comes forward only as a helper, facilitator of personal self-realizations. The paradigm of pedagogics of authority and pedagogics of manipulation are largely the same, as in both cases it is the educator who determines the goal of upbringing and possesses the right to form socially desirable dispositions and value orientations. It gives ground to consider the corresponding paradigms to be the two variants of the monological strategy of educational interaction as viewed by G. Ball and M. Burgin. Thus we come to the conclusion about the existence of two basic paradigms of upbringing: the monological one granting the pedagogue the right to form personality in accordance with their own ideas of the ideal of education, and the dialogical paradigm denying this right thus admitting the right of a child to self-determination.

A similar position is observed by the Polish researcher R. Kwasnica, who distinguishes the theories of authoritarian education (conservative and behavioral pedagogics) and antiauthoritarian education (humanistic and liberal pedagogics) [Kwasnica 1987]. In the theories of authoritarian education, that represent adaptational pedagogy, the aim of educator is seen as adaptation of children to the existing living conditions, formation of pupils' personalities according to the desirable public standards, managing their development, developing desirable and eradication of undesirable qualities. To the

contrary, in authoritarian theories that represent emancipative pedagogy, the aim of education is seen in the development of pupils, which is understood as facilitation of their self-realization, self-education, as unselfish support of their internal freedom getting established.

In authoritarian theories education is understood as direct influence on a child, passing prepared knowledge, values and standards of behavior to them; as disciplining, submission of a pupil to the will of the educator. In antiauthoritarian theories education is interpreted as indirect influence on a child that means organization of conditions favourable for their development; as an assistance to the pupils in their self-cognition; as learning without coercion, acknowledgement of the person's right to their own way of development; as approval of autonomy, individuality, subjectivity of pupil and educator.

The supporters of both types of theories see the educator's mission in the support of personality formation of pupils, but they understand the essence and the objectives of such support differently though. In adaptational pedagogics help is understood as management of a pupil's development. The public status of educator legitimizes their right to interfere in pupils' affairs and change their development at his own will. A teacher makes decisions concerning what is valuable or useful for the pupils on his own, without their participation. The educator on his own or using the power he possesses, authorises himself for the following:

- to manage another person for the sake of their interests and to determine that alone;
- to demand from pupils behavior that corresponds to his requirements and recommendations;
- to guard pupils from errors, to show them the correct patterns of behavior.

Contrary to it, the supporters of emancipative pedagogy understand educator's support not as management, but as suggestion. They recognize that every pupil is individual that lives in their own world that is why educator's help is given with the account of the following two suppositions:

- the right to interfere in the world of another person can be admitted only by this person, as he or she asks the educator for help; the sphere and content of the powers accessible to the educator also depend on this person;
- until the first condition is realized, the educator has to occupy the position of non-interference; the educator makes their own decisions as to the manner and matter of suggestions, but regards them as their own viewpoints, rather than imperative advice or recommendations to the pupils.

Help in the form of a suggestion addressed to the pupil or a discussion of their own opinion (feelings, impressions etc.) does not violate their autonomy and is recognized as morally acceptable.

Comparing both pedagogics (adaptive and emancipative), R. Kwasnica draws conclusions concerning their fundamental likeness on many parameters:

- Both approaches regard the essence of education as the purposeful specially organized activity that is directly estimated by its consequences in accordance with the criteria of technically understandable efficiency.
- Both approaches, being concentrated on the questions: what kind of person should be raised? and how is it accomplished? leaves another important question unattended: whether we should actually bring anybody up. In their discussion the problem of legitimity of education is not viewed as a consciously organized purposeful activity.
- The theoretical status of questions, though solved differently, remain identical: both approaches are concentrated on a solution of the problem "What kind of person should be brought up and how should it be done?"; "How should upbringing be organized so that it is more effective?" In this sense these are technical questions eligible only in the prospect of instrumental rationality [Kwasnica 1987].
- It is obvious that R. Kwasnica makes conception of antipedagogics go beyond the scope of his analysis, which gives a definite answer to the

questions set, denying legitimity of education as a purposeful activity [Kwasnica 1987].

Basis of Different Looks to Essence of Upbringing

Thus, pedagogical literature describes different theories of upbringing, which can be generally split into two opposite types: authoritarian (monological) and antiauthoritarian (dialogical). What is the basis of such different, often diametrically opposite perspectives on the essence of upbringing? We are inclined to consider that the eventual reason of the existence of different theories and models of upbringing are differences in understanding the essence of human nature. It deals with an answer to the question: "Is a human being (a child) constructive or destructive by nature?" S. Bratchenko, guided by the criterion of belief-disbelief in a human being, her constructive essence, divides educational approaches into two groups: those, that trust the human nature (humanistically oriented) and those that do not (authoritarian) [Bratchenko 1998]. Within each group, in is turn, it is possible to find certain differences that is why it is reasonable to introduce the following division:

1. Approaches that disbelieve in the constructive nature of man (pessimists):

1.1. *Initially negative perspective*: the nature of man is negative, asocial and destructive, and a person cannot handle it on his or her own (freudianism).

1.2. *Passively neutral perspective*: a man is deprived of natural essence at first is a neutral object of external formative influences (behaviourism, soviet psychology).

2. Approaches that believe in constructive nature of man (optimists):

2.1. *Unconditionally positive perspective*: a human being has undoubtedly positive, kind and constructive essence, set in as a potential that opens up in corresponding conditions (humanistic psychology of C. Rogers, A. Maslow and others).

2.2. *Conditionally positive look*: at first a human being does not have any internal essence, but acquires it as a result of self-creation, meanwhile positive actualization is not assured, but is a result of a person's own free and responsible choice (existential approach of V. Frankl, J. Bugental and others).

Although this chart somewhat simplifies the real variety of approaches, it makes an accent on the fundamental differences and to a certain degree outlines the scope of possible methods of understanding the essence of upbringing and its value in personality development.

In accordance with the implicit basic disposition concerning the essential nature of man, they solve the problem of "what to do" with this essence, so that the person can become "better": whether it is necessary to bring her up and if it is, then how is it done? The problem of the sense of upbringing is, in principle, solved as follows:

- *if the essence of man is negative, it needs to be corrected*;
- *if it does not exist, then it needs to be created, formed and "inserted" in a person* (in both cases "interests of society", "social demand" come forward as the main reference points);
- *if she is positive, we need to help it open up*;
- *if the essence is acquired through free choice of a person, then we should help her to make this choice* (in the latter two cases interests of a person are take as a basis).

S. Bratchenko points out that contradictions between different conceptions, that are based on different fundamental dispositions concerning the nature of man, as a rule, come to no result because "axiomatic positions, actually different beliefs collide. And belief, as is known, is not much receptive to arguments in a discussion, and treats facts just as a magnet treats objects, attracting only what belongs to it" [Bratchenko 1998, p. 20].

Thus, in the basis of authoritarian, monological conceptions of upbringing lies a pessimistic look on the nature of man (a child), disbelief in her constructive essence. Antiauthoritarian or dialogic conceptions of upbring-

ing are based on positive perception of the nature of man, on belief in her constructive creative origin.

Pedagogical Expediency of Different Upbringing Approaches

The existence of different theories and models of upbringing logically sets a question of an estimation of their pedagogical propriety and legitimity.

In the attitude towards different conceptions of upbringing one may observe signs of dichotomous thinking that means considering problems on the basis of a single alternative choice by the principle of 'or – or': 'black or white', 'good or evil'. It is the type of thinking that involves mutually exclusive categories, alternatives, that manifests itself in the inclination to divide the world into black and white without being conscious of half-tones. The dichotomous thinking operates mutually exclusive opposites and in a pedagogical context shows up in absolutizing the advantages of one of educational approaches as opposed to the other [Haluziak 2017]. As a rule, 'good' (humanistic, dialogical) educational approaches are contrasted to 'bad' (antihumanistic, monological, imperative). The analytical reviews of different conceptions of upbringing often end in definite conclusions about the humanistic approach being perfect, in the context of which upbringing is interpreted as an assistance to a person's self-actualization. In the majority of cases, manipulative upbringing is negatively estimated. Mental and ethical consideration act as dominant arguments in this concern. It is claimed, in particular, that manipulative upbringing humiliates a pupil's dignity, who does not appear to be an equal partner of the educator, but rather an object of his hidden influences. Many humanistically oriented teachers feel indignant about a teacher assuming the right to set his own educational goals, imposing his own values and viewpoints on the children. The idea of the freedom of pupils being limited as well as control and management of their behavior is also rejected.

In our view, such apprehensions and convictions are not always well grounded. As a rule, the are based on a rigorous ethical position, that does not take into account the graduality, evolution of personality development, including her subjectivity. It can not be denied that on the initial stage of education the relations between child and educator have asymmetric character conditioned by objective differences in the level of their development. Naturally, at the beginning of her development, being fully dependent upon the environment, a child is mainly an object of educational influences of the teacher. Only gradually does the child acquire qualities and abilities necessary for self-determination and partnership with adults. The apologists of humanistic, antiauthoritarian education often ignore this rule, a priori perceiving children as fully mature persons, from the very beginning capable of self-regulation and responsible independent choice. The level of personal maturity of children that can only be attained in the process of their development is viewed as a reality.

It should be admitted that guidance and submission are the necessary elements of an educational process that in no way denies the respect to a pupil's personality. In education a teacher deals with an individual that constantly changes, develops and in the process of interaction with adults gradually acquires the characteristics of the subject of behavior. The formation of personality involves the assimilation of certain moral values and rules. "Such assimilation does not form on its own. It is provided by the system of external norms and limitations that a child gradually internalizes under the direction of the elders" [Stepanov 2000, p. 26]. Education at this stage can be considered as mainly one-sided influence of the educator on the child. But as it develops, forms the character, self-awareness, assimilation of moral values, first the asymmetric educational process gradually acquires mutually directed forms, passes to the level of subject-subject relations. It is important for a teacher to feel the pace of this progressive process and to assist it, forming moral orientations, the ability of volitional self-regulation and responsible self-determination of a pupil, gradually expanding the freedom of their ac-

tions. It is important to gradually change relations with pupils who, losing the element of directiveness, should become more democratic and free. When education is constantly carried out from authoritarian positions, it can lead to deformations in the personal development of pupils. Another extreme is giving children complete freedom from the very beginning which can result in infantileness and inability to self-control. According to G. Ball and M. Burgin "the attempts (for example, in the projects of "society without schools" after I. Illich) of giving the children "maximum freedom" without taking into account their age-specific features and providing the process of learning with perfect, scientifically and culturally tested norms of activity are unproductive. After all, involvement in the systems of such norms (including alternative ones in relation to each other, dialogically interacting in the process of cultural development) serves as a prerequisite for the conscious and free self-determination of an individual" [Ball, Burgin 1994, p. 65]. I. Vachkov, who adheres to the same position, argues that an adult can not avoid "the responsibility for transmission (exactly transmission!) to a child of a certain system of values that must allow them to determine the criteria for their first independent choices" [Vachkov 2000, p. 13].

H. Ball and M. Burgin are fairly balanced in their approach to the assessment of pedagogical expediency of monological and dialogical educational strategies, which were distinguished by them. In their view, "in all its facets the pedagogical activity involves psychological influence on those who are taught (pupils). This also applies to 'facilitation' with the clarification that in the latter case the effects are dialogical, more indirect. Obviously, monological influences in pedagogical activity are also indispensable. They are useful first of all in the teaching of 'wisdom', or, expressed by a modern language, in the formation of clearly defined knowledge, skills and other normative components of the instrumental equipment of a personality" [Ball, Burgin 1994, p. 64]. Moreover, even in the dialogic influences intended to regulate the process of development of the motivational qualities of pupils, a certain normative (and therefore monologic) aspect is necessary in the sense that

such influences are intended to promote the inclusion of recipients (through disclosure of the individual capabilities of each of them) to a certain system of values – ethical, aesthetic, civic – which was tested by the society and accepted by the teacher" [Ball, Burgin 1994, p. 64]. Thus, H. Ball and M. Burgin, in contrast to radical supporters of anti-authoritarian pedagogy, recognize the right of an educator to purposefully form a certain system of normative values in children.

In our opinion, it is impossible to determine unequivocally, without regard to specific circumstances, the feasibility or inexpediency of a model of upbringing. An educational approach that is effective under certain conditions may be unproductive in others. "Despite all the fundamental advantages of the dialogic approach, says G. Ball, imperative and manipulative effects at certain points in the pedagogical process are often necessary from tactical, situational considerations [...]" [Ball 1998, p. 45].

According to S. Stepanov, the constructive path consists of combining the advantages of various educational approaches and the refusal of the disadvantages inherent in any model of education [Stepanov 2000, p. 26]. There is rational essence in each model and distortions begin where the positive aspects of an approach are overestimated.

Y. Yamburg considers that in a philosophical plan the basis of the conflict of pedagogical paradigms is the collision of different values, which leads to different ideas about the goals, values and the final results of education. Since the values contradict one another, the final decision in favor of one of the pedagogical strategies is impossible. Each pedagogical paradigm has serious grounds and reflects certain aspects of pedagogical reality, therefore their harmonization is required. The author suggests the principles on which such harmonization should be based:

- *the principle of pedagogical pluralism* – recognition of the equal coexistence of all paradigms;
- *the principle of overcoming one-sidedness*, which implies awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of each paradigm;

- *the principle of mutual complementation*, according to which at each stage of development of the child's personality the optimal combination of approaches will be different, but at the same time it must be carefully considered, substantiated and adequately technologically ensured;

- *the principle of finding the spheres of intersection*, which allows, on the one hand, to see common areas of application for different paradigms, and on the other hand, to correctly determine the significance of each of them in solving a particular pedagogical problem;

- *the principle of hierarchy* which involves prioritization for both the educational process as a whole and for its local segments (we note that Y. Yamburg considers the cultural pedagogical paradigm as a priority) [Yamburg 2004, p. 95].

R. Kwasnica also observes that the dispute between different conceptions of education (adaptive and emancipative) has a value nature and can not be unequivocally resolved in favor of one of these concepts. Each approach has its own arguments which, in their own axiological perspective, are sufficient and convincing. However, as any other argument, they are particular and biased, which both sides prefer not to notice, requiring for their own concept exclusivity and unconditional acceptance [Kwasnica 1987, p. 111].

Thus, in pedagogical literature there are different views on the pedagogical feasibility of different educational approaches. The range of opinions extends from the recognition of an approach (usually a humanistic one) as being the most effective to the assertion that there is a fundamental lack of a universal, absolutely effective model of education and the need for their harmonious combination and complementarity.

We believe that the reviewed approaches to upbringing should be considered not as alternative, among which there are better and worse ones, priority and secondary, but as successive stages of a unified pedagogical strategy that corresponds to the stages of personal formation of pupils. Each of the pedagogical paradigms has certain advantages and limitations, as well as

the scope of its suitability, which is determined primarily by the level of the individual maturity of the pupil: the higher this level, the less prescriptive and freer should become education up to a complete rejection of purposeful influences on the person. The gradual change of educational approaches in the direction from external management and purposeful formation to the development in the personality of self-management, self-identification and self-determination is significant.

S. Gessen, in particular, maintained the same position considering the problem of contradiction between freedom and coercion in education [Gessen 1995]. The development of individual freedom, in his view, is possible through moral education, whose task is to eliminate the natural coercion (dependence of the individual from the environment) and the formation of internal freedom, which is possible "only through the supply of superpersonal goals to an individual, in the creative direction to which its sustainable force increases" [Gessen 1995, p. 86]. At the same time, the two extremes should be avoided at the successive stages of moral education: anomie (lack of moral norms in the child) – heteronomy (assimilation of external norms) – autonomy (development of their own norms). The first one is the premature education in the conditions of constant pressure of the external environment, when "the external material offered to a child exceeds the ability to assimilate it". This leads to the formation of broken, impersonal people. Another extreme is the isolation of a child from cultural influences, which leads to the formation of impulsive persons deprived of "inner strength", incapable of self-determination and confrontation with the pressure of the environment. The wise upbringing is the proportionality of the external material and a child's internal ability to assimilate it. The art of an educator is to lead a pupil between two extremes: a broken and immature personality. For this purpose, in the upbringing one must move consistently from the external formation to the development of pupil's self-governance, capacity for responsible self-determination, from anomie to autonomy. "Freedom must penetrate and thereby consistently abolish every act of coercion, which is used as necessary in education" [Gessen 1995, p. 88].

Thus, there is a complex dialectical connection between freedom and coercion: born entirely dependent on the environment, a person can be free from this dependence only because of the gradual formation of their "inner strength", moral consciousness, autonomy and ability to self-governance. At the beginning of education there is coercion in the broad sense of the word associated with the complete subordination of the child to the environment. Gradually, with the development of personality, the assimilation of cultural values, their internal position, the ability to withstand the influence of the environment, to defend their 'self' are formed. Thus, moral education, which begins with the child's complete dependence on external factors, should ultimately lead to the formation of internal freedom of the individual. Freedom, therefore, is not a given, but a goal, a task of upbringing. "That being the case, the very alternative of free or compulsory education disappears, and both freedom and coercion turn out to be the principles which are not opposite, but mutually penetrating into each other" [Gessen 1995, p. 61]. As we see, the pedagogical contradiction between coercion and freedom is resolved by refraining from understanding them as antagonistic alternatives and forming a synthetic point of view on them as on the successive stages of the development of the individual and the educational process, which gradually change each other.

Conclusion

Monological and dialogical (adaptive and emancipative) models of education, in our view, should be considered not as alternative, but as stages of a unified educational strategy that gradually evolves simultaneously with the personal development of pupils: from direct leadership and formation through indirect educational effects to the promotion of free self-development of personality [Haluziak 2002]. It is important, as personal growth develops, to gradually expand the freedom of pupils, give them more scope to display initiative and independence, prepare them for a free, responsible choice. From the dialectical point of view, the ultimate goal of education is the actual denial – the

achievement of such a level of the individual maturity of the pupil when the need for external management of their behaviour and development disappears, education becomes unnecessary since the person becomes capable of self-management and responsible self-determination.

Bibliography

Амонашвили Ш.А. (1995), *Размышления о гуманной педагогике*, Издательский Дом Шалвы Амонашвили, Москва.

Балл Г.А., Бургин М.С. (1994), *Анализ психологических воздействий и его педагогическое значение,* "Вопросы психологии", № 4.

Балл Г. (1998), *Проблема додержання вимог наукової культури в дослідженнях гуманістично зорієнтованих освітніх процесів,* "Освіта і управління", № 3.

Братченко С.Л. (1998), *Верим ли мы в ребенка? Личностный рост с позиций гуманистической психологи,* "Журнал практического психолога", № 1.

Вачков И. (2000), *Двуликий Янус гуманистического воспитания,* "Школьный психолог", № 48.

Галузяк В.М. (2017), *Діалектичне мислення як критерій особистісно-професійної зрілості педагога,* "Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені М.Коцюбинського. Серія: педагогіка і психологія", Вип. 52.

Галузяк В.М. (2002), *Типологія базових моделей виховання* "Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені М.Коцюбинського. Серія: педагогіка і психологія", Вип. 7.

Гессен С.И. (1995), *Основы педагогики. Введение в прикладную философию,* "Школа-Пресс", Москва.

Корнетов Г.Б. (2001), *Итоги и перспективы парадигмально-педагогической интерпретации моделей образовательного процесса,* "Гуманітарні науки", № 1.

Степанов С. (2000), Воспитание без крайностей, “Школьный психолог”, № 40.

Ямбург Е.А. (2004), *Гармонизация педагогических парадигм – стратегия развития образования* [в:] *Проблемы внедрения психолого-педагогических исследований в системе образования,* ERGO, Москва.

Kwaśnica R. (1987), *Dwie racjonalności. Od filozofii sensu ku pedagogice ogólnej*, IKN ODN we Wrocławiu, Wrocław.

von Braunmuhl E. (1975), *Antipadagogik. Studien zur Abschaffung der Erziehung*, Weinheim, Basel.