



Олена Квас,

доктор педагогічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри загальної педагогіки та педагогіки вищої школи, Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка (м.Львів, Україна)

Olena Kvas,

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, the Head of the Department of General Pedagogy and Pedagogy of Higher School, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv (Lviv, Ukraine)

I_kvas@ukr.net

ORCID 0000-0001-9680-0878

УДК37.015.31:316.42

ДИТИНСТВО В ДИСКУРСІ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ ПОЧАТКУ ХХІ СТ.

Анотація. Мета статті – аналіз сучасного наукового дискурсу досліджень проблем дитинства.

У статті схарактеризовано особливості інтерпретації феномену дитинства на зламі століть. Установлено, що сучасні дослідники дитинства інтерпретують його здебільшого через традиційні академічні дискурси, що полягають у поділі дитинства між психологією, соціологією та антропологією. Розкрито особливості міждисциплінарного підходу в процесі дослідження дитинства, яке стосується інтегрованої методології вивчення проблем, пов'язаних із життям дітей та їхнім захистом, що, свою чергою, формує сучасне трактування «дитини в контексті». Ця візія дитинства дає змогу розглядати його як один із пріоритетів державної політики в багатьох країнах світу. Дослідженням обґрунтовано ідею про те, що проблема дитинства в сучасних суспільних науках досить часто визначається як напрям, що значною мірою полягає в традиційному теоретизуванні та визнанні великої кількості засобів суспільного конструювання та реконструювання дитинства, залежно від часу та місця, віку та статі, етнічних та релігійних відмінностей тощо. Проаналізовано поняття «дитина», яке стосується «недорослої», «незрілої» особистості; у той же час поняття «дитинство» є більш загальним та абстрактним і свідчить про статус тих, кого називають недорослими. Зокрема, окреслено, що дорослість можна визначити через фізичну або сексуальну зрілість, інколи через правову дієздатність. Можемо констатувати, що термін «дитинство» зосереджується головним чином на стані буття дитини, безвідносно до окремо взятої дитини; він передбачає наявність відмінної, окремої, фундаментально іншої суспільної категорії – «дитинства». Однак найскладнішим завданням залишається з'ясування того, наскільки переломні етапи суспільного життя, зміни й тенденції належать до дослідницького поля та академічного дискурсу дитинства і наскільки вони відображають та характеризують закономірності розвитку суспільних наук, а також парадигмальні зміни в педагогіці.

Ключові слова: дитина, дитинство, дитиноцентризм, виховання, дискурс досліджень, суспільні зміни.

CHILDHOOD IN THE DISCOURSE OF HUMANITARIAN STUDIES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE XXI CENTURY

Abstract. The aim of the study is to analyze the modern scientific discourse of research on childhood problems. The article examines the peculiarities of the interpretation of the phenomenon of childhood at the turn of the century. It has been established that modern researchers of childhood interpret it mostly through traditional academic discourses, which consist in the division of childhood between psychology, sociology and anthropology. The peculiarities of the interdisciplinary approach in the process of childhood research are revealed, which refers to the integrated methodology of studying problems related to the life of children and their protection, which, in its turn, forms the modern interpretation of "the child in context". This vision of childhood allows us to consider it as one of the priorities of state policy in many countries of the world. The research substantiates the idea that the problem of childhood in modern social sciences is quite often defined as a direction that largely consists in traditional theorizing and recognition of a large number of means of social construction and reconstruction of childhood, depending on time and place, age and gender, ethnic and religious differences, etc. The concept of "child", which refers to an "immature" personality, has been studied; at the same time, the concept of "childhood" is more general and abstract and indicates the status of those who are called minors. In particular, it is outlined that adulthood can be defined through physical or sexual maturity, sometimes through legal capacity. We can state that the term "childhood" focuses mainly on the child's state of being, without having to do with an individual child; it assumes the existence of a distinct, separate, fundamentally different social category – "childhood". However, the most difficult task remains to find out to what extent critical stages of social life, changes and trends belong to the research field and academic discourse of childhood and how much they reflect and characterize the patterns of development of social sciences, as well as paradigmatic changes in pedagogy.

Keywords: child, childhood, child-centrism, upbringing, research discourse, social changes.

INTRODUCTION

The problem formulation. One of the priorities of the state policy in the reform of education in Ukraine is the transition from the authoritarian and disciplinary model of education and upbringing to a person-oriented one, which



is provided by the National Doctrine of the Development of Education of Ukraine in the 21st century. Its essential features are the creation of favorable conditions for self-development and self-education of the individual, meaningful definition of one's capabilities, life goals.

In these conditions, researches that are conducted today regarding the early periods of a person's life - childhood - acquire priority. Emphasizing the attention of researchers on the child as a human being remains one of the most urgent pedagogical problems all over the world. The child becomes the central figure in all processes related to its upbringing, education and development.

The concept of child-centrism in both foreign and domestic pedagogy has its own history. It acquired a scientific content with the emergence of a new pedagogical trend – pedocentrism (Greek *pais* – child, Latin *centrum* – centrism, environment), according to which the organization and methods of teaching are determined only by the immediate, spontaneous interests and needs of children. The content of this concept is much deeper, because the problem of child-centrism was relevant not only for reformist pedagogy, but also for ethnopedagogy, Christian pedagogy, pedagogy, health pedagogy, etc.

Child-centrism or childhood pedagogy is present on the margins of any of the maps that classify modern pedagogical directions and currents, regardless of their philosophical and socio-political ideologues.

There is no doubt that child-centrism contributes to a holistic interpretation of pedagogy in a historical perspective, due to the fact that with the change of generations, pedagogy also changes to a certain extent. In this regard, the experience of this field of knowledge helps future researchers to understand the ambiguity of pedagogical terms that have been introduced into circulation by representatives of various pedagogical currents. In this case, we are talking about the need for a scientific reflection of the historical path that child-centrism pedagogy took from the period of its formation and development, to its decline and new understanding.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The research was based on the following theoretical and methodological approaches: structural analysis (Emil du Bois-Reymond, G. Krueger, B. Sliversky, etc.), which, enabling the coverage of a significant research field, provides a basis for conducting a discourse of problems child and childhood during the development of human civilization; dynamic analysis of development (Philippe Ariès, Arnold, Zinnecker, etc.), which is based on the study of social contexts of childhood; evolutionary approach, which consists in studying the development of certain categories, theories, regularities, etc.; sociocultural approach (A. James Prout), which emphasizes the study of the child's ways of being and different types of childhood.

Recently, at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, more and more historians are trying to study childhood through postmodernist theories, in particular, the problem of the meaning of children and childhood for adults (N. Postman, M. Winns, etc.).

THE AIM AND RESEARCHT ASKS

The aim of the study outline and analyze the main trends in the development of child-centered ideas in foreign and domestic pedagogy in the first half of the 21st century.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research methods: the presented research uses the dialectical method, thanks to which it is possible to consider the subject of research in all its interrelationships and dependencies; the method of system analysis, which contributed to the comprehensive study of child-centrism in the educational discourse; comparative-historical and hermeneutic methods that provided insight into the inner essence of the process of the formation of child-centrism; search and bibliographic for studying library catalogs; the method of theoretical generalization, which made it possible to form well-founded conclusions based on the results of the scientific research work and to determine the possibilities of using the ideas of child-centrism in the modern educational space of Ukraine.

RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

Today, the educational process is considered not only as the transfer of knowledge and the development of abilities and skills, but as a process of expansion, improvement and renewal of already existing cognitive schemes. After all, what a child will learn at school largely depends on what it already knows itself.

Creating a favorable environment for effective learning at school according to child-centered ideas leads to the fact that: the main emphasis in education is on the research process of the student's search for the truth, the nature of phenomena, connections, in this process the key concept is the interest of students; primary competencies of students are enriched, expanded and supplemented; students strive to achieve such results that could increase their own educational potential; the teacher creates conditions for students' creative activity in the lesson.

Thus, the goal of learning is not the assimilation and reproduction of the knowledge and algorithmic skills imparted by the teacher, but the creation (construction) of knowledge by the student himself. The knowledge acquired in the student's mind in this way has a dynamic, dialogic, emancipatory character. They become part of his own life experience and give him the right to his own understanding of the world at the same time as personal responsibility for this understanding.

The creative model of learning, which is sometimes called constructive, is a modern carrier of child-centered ideas, strengthened by pedagogical cooperation. This model is built on a natural basis. When using it at school, the following requirements should be taken into account:

- only through social activities can a child get a space to interpret his own experience, he learns to use the essence of cognitive phenomena in such a way that would be in accordance with the requirements of the



cultural environment in which the child is (class, school, etc.); its activity is always perceived in a cultural and historical context.

- the student must believe in himself as a person who learns and also has the right to decide how to learn;
- the teacher at school ceases to be the only guarantor of the truth, but he is responsible for the methods, technologies and forms of organization of the educational process; the basis of this approach is learning in a group (class), the members of which, in the broadest sense of the word, cooperate in the process of acquiring their knowledge, all students are included in the participation;
- the teacher's role in the educational process changes from a mentor to a advisor (consultant), he becomes a person who outlines the goal, proposes tasks, monitors the development of students, supports their activity, encourages cooperation (Ch. Biuler M. Allen, 2004).

One of the main achievements of the creative school model, where the child builds his own knowledge, is the reliance on student relationships. The traditional model of education and upbringing overestimates adult-child, teacher-student interaction. This model is based on an anthropocentric approach to learning. Child-child interaction is relegated to the extracurricular environment, although these relationships are an important component of the socialization of children and youth, their cognitive, social and moral activities. It is obvious that the school will have to become more child-centered, more natural and organized in such a way that learning, life and emotions will not be separated from each other.

The ideas of child-centrism regarding child education remain extremely relevant today. Modern child-centrism increasingly focuses on research into the activities of social structures in a certain space where the processes of children's daily life interact as actors of the environment in which they live (Pedahohichnyy slovnyk, 2001).

This especially applies to children marginalized by society, who live in poverty and demoralization. These are children who do not find support in the family, at school, in educational and guardianship institutions, and are forced to look for friendliness, a sense of security, and proper shelter on the street. Child-centrism in the postmodern society must be deeply rooted in philosophy and social pedagogy. Thanks to research on the problems of "street children", it will be possible to find ways to solve them through social intervention and improvement of their living space (Kremen', 2009). Today, child-centrism examines not only the child, but also the world in which he lives. The study of the child's living space involves the study of the character, patterns and actions of people who concentrate their vital activity on a small spatial segment. Here we can talk about the "geographic aspect" of specific realities that take place in the child's living space (city, district, street).

For a social pedagogue, it is important to always keep in mind that when studying a child's living space, the child's socio-pedagogical and natural development are closely intertwined. Social facts, in particular pedagogical ones, have a different origin than natural laws, so their predictability is also different. You can understand them only when they have already formed into a single whole, hence the need for their description, analysis and an attempt to understand them ex post. It is possible to do this only through the reconstruction of historical and pedagogical studies and their extrapolation to modern pedagogical science and practice.

Human rights begin with the rights of the child, all those who not only teach and educate the young generation, but also bear full responsibility for it, should know about this. If the rights of the child are a component of the educational process and the education system, then they significantly increase the importance of both human and child rights, as well as the education system itself.

The reorientation of modern social culture towards mutual respect for the rights of both adults and children confirms the opinion that adults should not be burdened with responsibilities towards children all the time, otherwise it threatens to become their serf; nor should children be given exclusive rights, because this could lead to anarchy. There is no doubt that society should recognize the rights of the young generation to freedom, self-respect, and life, which would guarantee both individual and social development. Responsibility in solving this issue should be manifested through the combination of children's rights with their responsibilities.

When implementing a child-centered approach to guaranteeing children's rights on the part of society, the latter must realize that these are not rights that should govern children or rights by which children would manage themselves. Rather than all this, there should be rights that would serve children, which should be observed, respected and protected from violation by other people, as well as by human-made institutions (state, school, authorities) from injustice.

If we say that the rights of a person, like the rights of a child, arise from his nature, then this means what is called natural law, an unwritten law, a law that is higher than the law established by man. Therefore, it is indestructible and cannot be removed. Moreover, if a society of adults seriously violates this right by limiting or ignoring it, it thereby supports the inevitable conflict between children and adults.

To the extent that modern law began to penetrate the relationships between children and adults, the relationships between them also changed, which went from despotic-subject to partnership-business, which increases the need for respect, love, trust and adaptation to ethical values on both sides. and ideals.

The process of children's awareness of their rights also has an important educational aspect, because it touches the conscience of educators, awakens the vulnerability of teachers and guardians to existing evil or pathology. A special responsibility rests on those who should stand on the side of the child's rights in the state, namely, on the children's rights commissioners.

A rather difficult barrier in changing the legal status of a child is a family that adheres to the traditional approach to family education, which consists in the right of the family to raise the child as it sees fit, sometimes even "breaking" the



child's personality in the name of I of parental authority. Thus, each family establishes for itself the right of social relations with children, to which children must obey.

Increasingly, educators are paying attention to the fact that the widespread myth about the moral self-improvement of adults through their observance of the rights of the child is nothing more than a myth. This is supported by the fact that, although most European countries consider a child to be a person from birth to 18 years of age, many of them do not have legislative acts or decrees that would regulate the state's policy in the field of protection of children's rights. In fact, a child cannot realize any of the rights that belong to him independently, but only through adults. According to Robert Farson, "The emancipation of children does not mean the disappearance of any morality, but on the contrary – the rejection of its duality" (Farson, 2005).

Our relationships should be based on the same principles, moral principles, beliefs and rights. Just as the actions of adults are subject to certain rules, value systems, and prescriptions, so should children. Because the goal of emancipatory aspirations is ultimately reduction possibilities of mutual enslavement (Farson, 2005).

One of the important rights of a child is his right to self-development, because it is thanks to this right that he can be freed from violence and self-determination.

The child's right to life without physical punishment is also obvious. It applies to almost all situations of communication between children and adults, including school and extracurricular facilities. Eliminating corporal punishment from the educational practice would encourage teachers to look for other ways and methods of working with children without harming them.

Representatives of the modern anti-pedagogical trend believe that the school belongs to those institutions that destroy human rights to freedom of learning and thinking (Illich, 2002). The school, in their opinion, is not only a tool for exercising power through its repressive and selective functions, but also a place for changing human nature according to the Puritan worldview. After all, children in this case are considered "savages" who need to be constantly tamed, directed and subordinated.

Anti-pedagogues claim that the learning process begins for each person in a natural way from birth and cannot be avoided or freed from it.

The only problem is whether children want to learn with or without coercion. Instead of supporting the existing order in schools, parents should be more supportive of their own children and friendly teachers, for the sake of a better and free upbringing (Kej, 2005).

If we take into account the axiological dimension of anti-pedagogy, then it gravitates more towards the personalistic direction in pedagogy, which in turn opens up more opportunities for dialogue between personalism and anti-pedagogy, and also outlines the field of joint activity to create new relationships between the child and educator, teacher.

Among the most widespread pedagogical currents of the second half of the 20th century, which actively implemented the ideas of child-centrism in their activities, was critical-emancipatory pedagogy, which arose on the basis of the critical theory of the Frankfurt School and the protest student and student movements of the late 60s. It was characterized by a variety of worldview ideas, from liberal, critical-rationalist to orthodox-marxist.

The existing school was criticized for such shortcomings as: school stress due to students' academic overload; low level of classes (old curricula, outdated teaching methods, etc.); the dominance of object-subject approaches in education.

In contrast to such a school, the representatives of this direction sought such a school that would: have children's trust, respect them as individuals; paid attention to all children without exception; created an atmosphere of benevolence in the school.

The goals of critical and emancipatory education were as follows: opposition and resistance to conformism; critical rationality instead of irrationality that serves the public interest; social changes instead of reproduction of what already exists; cooperation and solidarity instead of fighting.

Critical and emancipatory pedagogy taught to resist what leads to harming a person. First of all, it is about the wrongs that a person suffers from society. The young generation should not immediately be involved in what is already stable and defined, because they should first of all think about themselves. Therefore, the key issues of the critical-emancipatory theory of education should be independence, criticism, creativity, and the struggle for social change.

Humanistic psychology and pedagogy, widespread in the West, also paid a lot of attention to child-centered ideas.

The main theses of humanistic psychology and pedagogy:

- The person is in the center of attention. In this way, evidence, as the most important phenomenon in human cognition, moves to the center;
- Emphasis is placed on specific traits of human character (ability to choose, creativity, self-assertion, ability to evaluate);
- The choice of formulated questions and research methods in the child's cognition should be adequate to their meaning;
- The main postulate of humanistic psychology and pedagogy is respect for human values and dignity (Shenebek, 2011).

The educational process focused on the teacher and on the individual are significantly different.

In the first case, the teacher possesses the knowledge that he must pass on to the students, in the second case, it is accepted that the students can think and learn by themselves; in the first case, the teacher has power, the students are obedient, in the second case, everyone is responsible for the learning process: the teacher, students, parents, society.



In German-speaking countries at the end of the 20th century, constructivist pedagogy gained great popularity. The ideas of constructivism were first presented by the Austrian scientist Paul Watzlawick in 1981, when he published the work "Invented Reality" (Entsyklopediya osvity, 2008). Constructivists believe that all reality is a construct created by people who believe that they are discovering and exploring reality.

The success of modern constructivism, on the one hand, lies in its similarity with cognitive psychology and systems theory, as well as such widespread phenomena in the modern world as individualization, postmodernism, and the crisis of normative disciplines (subjects).

The key competencies of constructivist pedagogy are: openness to differences, pluralism, the unknown; tolerance of disagreements, paradoxes and uncertainty; ability and willingness to observe; responsibility for one's own and others' emotionality; ability and willingness to accept decisions and suggestions from others; openness to public topics and key issues.

CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

All of the above gives reason to assert that child-centric ideas, just like a hundred years ago, find their place on various fields of modern maps of social sciences, regardless of the system of ideological or political coordinates in which they are located.

It can also be stated that the problems of childhood, which society tried to solve in the past centuries, did not decrease, they even increased and they became more difficult to solve than before. Cyber addiction, drug addiction, alcoholism, pedophilia, AIDS, this is far from a complete list of new challenges for the society of the 21st century, which must solve these problems already today, not forgetting that there are also other traditional ones – which move from one historical and social formations to another – problems of family education, violence against children, orphanhood, education, education, etc.

If at the beginning of the last century Ellen Key called it the "Century of the Child", and in the end it turned out to be a century in which two world wars took place, hundreds of wars between individual countries, thousands of religious armed conflicts and the same number of inter-ethnic conflicts in which millions died children, then it is better not to call the 21st century with lofty words, but to try to make every adult remember that the fate of the future of humanity depends on them, because it is in the hands of children. How we will raise them, what we will teach them, and how we will teach them, that will be the future.

REFERENCES

- Ch. Biuler M. Allen. (2004). Vstup do humanistychnoi psykholohii [Einführung in die humanistische Psychologie]. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta. [in German].
Pedahohichnyy slovnyk [Pedagogical dictionary]. (2001). [za redaktsiyeyu chynnoho chlena APN Ukrayiny Yarmachenka M]. Kyiv: Pedahohichna dumka. [in Ukrainian].
Kremen', V. (2009). Pro «ditotsentryzm», abo Chomu ukrayins'ka osvita potrebuye strukturnykh zmin [About "child-centrism", or why Ukrainian education needs structural changes]. Shchodenna ukrayins'ka hazeta «Den'», 210 (3130), 19 lystopada, p.1. [in Ukrainian].
Farson, R. (2005). Prava liudyny dlia ditej. Ostannia menshist' [Menschenrechte für Kinder. Die letzte Minderheit]. Miunkhen. [in German].
Illich, I. (2002). Suspil'stvo bez shkoly [Społeczeństwo bez szkoły]. Varshava: PIN. [in Polish].
Kej, E. (2005). Storichchia dytyny [Stulecie dziecka] [perekład I. Mschens'koi]. Varshava: Wydawnictwo Akademickie "ŻAK". [in Polish].
Shenebek, Kh. (2011). Tema shkoly. Scho vzhe mozhut' zrobyty bat'ky ta vchyteli – 20 porad, druzhba z dit'my [Thema Schule. Was Eltern und Lehrer schon tun können-20 Vorschläge, Freundschaft mit Kindern]. Miunster, 8–11 [in German].
Entsyklopediya osvity. [Encyclopedia of education]. (2008). Akad. ped. nauk Ukrayiny; hol. red. V. H. Kremen'. Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter. [in Ukrainian].

Received 12.07.2022
Accepted 26.07.2022