

ON THE ISSUE OF PARADIGMATIC GROUNDS FOR THE SOCIAL PROJECTION OF THE CENTRAL (INSTITUTIONALIZED) COMPONENT

Ildar Nakipovich Valiev¹, Sergey Alekseevich Sedov²

¹Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Elabuga Institute, e-mail: val2876@mail.ru, тел.: 8-9172411051

²Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Elabuga Institute

ABSTRACT

The polyparadigmatic approach to the social projection of the municipal educational environment is a conjunction of the various methodologies' combined elements that require for their analysis different paradigmatic grounds.

The polyparadigmatics of the municipal educational environment's projection is in the need to be used for: - the projection of the central sphere in the municipal educational environment; - for the projection in the mesosphere of the educational environment; - for solving problems of social projection in the external (peripheral) sphere of the municipal educational environment. The author of the article solves the problems of social projection in the studied sphere of the educational environment in the context of a polyparadigmatic approach that ensures a stable, pre-determined result.

The article substantiates the polyparadigmatics of the grounds for the social projection in the municipal educational environment. The program-target and problem-target methods, as well as methods of linear and emergency control are used. As a result, it was recognized, for example, that the polyparadigmatic approach to the projection in the educational environment is a consequence of the educational environment's complexity itself as an objective social phenomenon; the conjunction of different projection paradigms is determined by the essential features of the designed project; there are three main objects in the structure of the educational environment that require a paradigmatically different approach to their projection - these are the spheres of the educational environment, distinguishing by the degree of institutionalization and characterized by qualitative distinctness: the central, external and mesosphere.

Keywords: social projection, polyparadigmatic approach, institutionalization, educational environment, polyparadigmatic projection.

INTRODUCTION

A considerable number of writings have been accumulated, where the causes of existing and emerging pedagogical problems are directly or indirectly discussed. Despite the difference in their interpretations, these reasons are inherently similar and can be implicitly generalized into a certain set. The development of criteria and indicators, the achievement of which would make an objective and possible the assertion about the elimination of the causes of national educational crisis, should be carried out on the basis of a perspective picture of Russian education. It requires a thorough study of the significant amount of writings devoted to the development of a "perspective picture of Russian education," to the generalization and formalization of conceptual provisions. The stage of generalization of writings from different scientific fields will also reveal aspects that need further improvement [1].

The stage of "paradigm wars" should lead to the rational, meaningful usage of all theories without exception in the practice of sociological researches, taking into account the characteristic aspects of Russian sociology and its main object - the social reality of a specific Russian society. A correct analysis of the main symptoms of paradigmatic changes is presented, in particular, in the works of Prof. N.N. Kozlova [2].

One of the few, but consistent opponents of polyparadigmality in sociology is Prof. N.V. Romanovsky. With reference to the Austrian scholar A. Balog's works [3], N.V. Romanovsky confirms that the legitimization of the polyparadigmatic approach is a manifestation of sociological crisis, its disintegration, and a tendency toward fragmentation of theoretical paradigms [4].

According to Andrias Balog, social phenomena are multiple (at least, dual) in their content. "Social phenomena demonstrate two different aspects. They are both "objective" and "subjective". Their "objectivity" (or autonomy) is the result of the fact that their existence is realized in the actions, attitudes or expectations of different people. Perhaps these people are simply individuals or representatives of institutions, perhaps, the expectations take an impersonal form, since they are defined by norms and conventions. The question whether this form of objectivity is perceived, from the authors' point of view, whose actions act as constituent elements of social facts, as a limitation or as a possibility, remains open. At the same time, "subjectivity" becomes obvious, as these phenomena are always perceived by the authors and realized in their actions. Social facts, realized in the actions of the authors, are inextricably linked with their personal ideas, intentions and desires. "Objectivity" is therefore inextricably linked with the "subjective" views of the authors, and social phenomena form a single whole of these two aspects "[5, p. 23].

However, without going into serious disputes about the legitimacy of the polyparadigmatic approach to sociological researches in general, let us consider the problem of its applicability with respect to the social projection of the educational environment, having previously made some general theoretical clarifications.

Next, it is necessary to substantiate the polyparadigmality of the grounds for the social projection of the municipal educational environment.

RESEARCH METHODS

Program-target and problem-target methods as a technological basis for managing multi-level processes; - a method of linear control based on control for the management of single-stage processes; - method of emergency control based on flexible solutions for managing weakly predictable processes should be used.

RESULTS

The problem of searching for a new paradigm of sociology in general or its separate dimensions is being rather intensively discussed during last two decades. Directly or indirectly, the paradigms' problems of sociological researches have been covered quite often in the sociological literature. This is primarily due to the intensified process of informational exchange between Russian sociology (being until recently the former totally Marxist) and the sociological schools of other countries. Thus, the analysis of the specificity of civilizational paradigms in Russia is reflected in L.I. Semennikova's articles; problems of the scientific paradigm's formation were considered by N.G. Kobyljatsky; V.A. Bachinin studied two paradigms (in the context of secular and religious dichotomy); a critical analysis of the problems of polyparadigmatics was carried out by N.V. Romanovsky and others.

The objective crisis of a positive in its essence Marxist-Leninist methodology, the penetration of many foreign theories to "the territory of Russian science", led to the legitimization of the polyparadigmatic approach. The poly- or multi-paradigm approach is becoming increasingly common in the humanities. Sociology is not an exception, although the problem of the methodological foundations of polyparadigmatics has not been adequately reflected by now in theoretical sociology.

The specified multiplicity of social phenomena creates the opportunity for their description by a sociologist from the standpoint of one or another approach chosen by the subject of knowledge in an almost arbitrary way (subjective preferences, desirability of obtaining the initially expected result, etc.). This is the reason for the multiplicity of paradigms used in sociology, which does not lead to an increase

in the objectivity of sociological researches but, on the contrary, to the imbalance of the obtained scientific results.

The analysis of the main sociological paradigms and the experience of their "parallel" usage by sociologists leads A. Balog to a dogmatic deny of multi- and polyparadigmality. He notes: "From an unbiased point of view, it should be argued that the existence of different approaches should be considered to be positive, as different incomplete views can enhance each other. However, it is not true. Separate theories are too different in scope of their claims to become a contribution to a single whole. The danger lies in the reduction of phenomena to the categories laid down in the theory. As a result, immutable social facts are denied when definitions are built only on theoretical premises without reference to the actions of real people. That is, problems are confined to a correspondingly reduced understanding, thereby limiting possible explanatory factors "[5, p. 31].

Of course, as with any "monoparadigm" theory, polyparadigmality can justify, or try to justify, the weaknesses of one's own research. It is unlikely that such manifestations should be attributed to the essence of the methodological foundations of the study. Otherwise, attempts to apply a class approach to the choice of a marriage partner, inconclusive and ridiculous in nature, should have served as a basis for oblivion of K. Marx's works' in the 30s. of XX century.

First of all, it is necessary to separate the polyparadigmality from a random combination of different paradigms within the boundaries of one research carried out at the whim of the researcher. In this case, the concept "eclectic" rather than "polyparadigmality" is more legitimate. Polyparadigmality also should not have anything in common with democracy in science, since science as a form of cognition of the world has nothing to do with democracy. The autocracy of data, information and knowledge is an immanent feature of scientific activity and scientific cognition.

The state of the educational environment, both in statics and in dynamics, contradicts the general tendencies on many points, which causes the emergence of a complex of objective contradictions that hamper the transition to a qualitatively new state. Elimination of these contradictions is the most important factor in the effectiveness of the development of a society, and the need to resolve them determines the main content of the social order of education [6].

Polyparadigm approach to the projection of the educational environment is not a fashion statement and not a consequence of the misbalance of the methodological foundations of modern sociology, but is a consequence of the unprecedented complication of the educational environment itself as an objective social phenomenon.

To justify the last conclusion, let us use an example connected with the development of the natural sciences. We can say that before the beginning of the twentieth century Physics was a monoparadigmatic science, because classical mechanics explained almost all known phenomena of the physical world. Exceptions were related only to the lack of an empirical basis, confirming the legitimacy of the theoretical "pudding" model of the atom's structure. Rutherford's subsequent experiments on the scattering of α -particles not only disproved this model, but also served as the basis for the emergence and rapid development of quantum (nonclassical) mechanics. At the same time, it does not occur to anyone to use the theory of quantum mechanics to describe the motion, for example, of the planets of the solar system, just as no one can use classical mechanics to explain the motion of electrons around the atomic nucleus. Classical and quantum mechanics do not exclude, but supplement each other in making a physical picture of the world.

The given example not only justifies the right to the existence of a polyparadigmatic approach in science in general (without division into natural and humanitarian ones), but also points to the deep essence of polyparadigmality. Indeed, if we analyze the same social phenomenon from the standpoint of an

individual, a production team, a society or humanity as a whole, then the evaluation of this phenomenon in all these cases will differ from each other.

In this case, we observe three different positions in the evaluation of the same event. And, despite the difference in these positions, each of them is quite legitimate. A sociologist who analyzes such a situation must take into account the points of view of all subjects of interaction. Thus, the polyparadigmality of sociological analysis reflects the difference in the positions of interacting social actors, as well as their objective social differences.

DISCUSSION

From the epistemological point of view, the problem of polyparadigmality is also explained quite simply. The paradigm, being a system of theoretical, methodological and axiological principles, that are traditionally used to solve scientific problems within the boundaries of a certain scientific school, is closely connected with sociology in relation to the problem of determination of social activity, with a certain dominant in its structure. So for Marx, who interpreted society as a totality of social relations, which are the essence of production relations arising from the mode of production, the whole variety of social manifestations is a logical consequence of the mode of production. At the same time, Freud explains the interaction of people with the action of subconscious sexual instincts. These are their paradigms, stemming from their ideas about the determinants of human behavior.

The paradox is that Marx and Freud, like all other thinkers, analyze the same object - man and society. The unity of the object, its "natural" integrity, determines the fundamental essential consistency of the various paradigms [7; 8; 9].

As for the problem of consistency / inconsistency of the various sociological schools' logical premises, the answer to this problem, oddly enough, is pointed out by the opponent of polyparadigmality A. Balog.

Thus, existing methodological contradictions are not fatal. Moreover, what concerns the educational environment, it is obvious to us that its various spheres related to the developing, shaping and educational influence itself made on the individual by society, family and school cannot be analyzed from the standpoint of only one paradigm. Otherwise, we come across a paradoxical in its essence, but rather widespread school's desire to teach parents (through lectures) to educate their children properly, using all the progressive achievements of pedagogy. That is, to shift to the family the functions of formal education. Such attempts are initially doomed to failure, as parents by definition can not engage in education in the proper pedagogical sense of the word. Otherwise, pedagogy as a sphere of professional activity turns out to be meaningless.

The mentioned above determines the need to consider the problems of social projection of the educational environment in the light of the most common paradigms of sociological research. At the same time, «Education goes far beyond the institutionalized educational activities. Social formation of a youth as a goal and result of education is an objective process, due to the huge number of factors, some of which are only available to be projectioned within the boundaries of an institutionalized education component» [10, c. 106-107].

The list of the main stages of projectioning of an institutionalized component of the educational environment includes: the definition of an objective municipal education need; the goal structuring; formulation of tasks, the implementation of which ensures achievement of tactical and strategic goals; the definition of forms, means and methods of implementing tasks; the definition of the material base necessary for solving problems; the definition of single and group functions associated with solving problems; selection of personnel in accordance with certain functions, etc.

CONCLUSION

1. The complication of the system of social and professional interaction makes it necessary to move many spontaneous educational processes into the field of social regulation, which fundamentally complicates the structure of the projected educational environment, including qualitatively different social phenomena that can not be projected within the boundaries of one paradigm.
2. Polyparadigmality excludes arbitrary combination of different paradigms within the boundaries of one research, carried out at the whim of the researcher. The usage of this or that projection paradigm is determined by the essential features of the projected object.
3. Three main objects that require a paradigmatically different approach to their projection are identified in the structure of the educational environment: these are spheres of the educational environment that differ in the degree of institutionalization and are characterized by qualitative certainty: the central, external and mesosphere. All other components and levels of the educational environment are manifested in all its spheres and can be viewed simultaneously from the point of view of all major paradigms.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS [IF ANY]

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

- Sergey A. Sedov and Larisa K. Obukhova, 2015. Integration of Education, Science and Production as Reflection of Interdependence of Political, Social, Spiritual and Economic Spheres of Social Life. *The Social Sciences*, 10: 946-950.
- Kozlova N.N., Smirnova N.M. Krizis klassicheskikh metodologij i sovremennaja poznavatel'naja situacija [The crisis of the classical methodologies and modern cognitive situation], 1995, no. 11. – pp. 12-22.
- Balog A. Neue Entwicklungen in der soziologischen Theorie. Stuttgart, 2001.
- Romanovskij N.V. Mul'tiparadigmal'naja sociologija - Auf wiedersehen? [Multi-paradigm sociology]. *Sociologicheskie issledovanija*, 2005, no. 12. – pp. 23-32.
- Balog A. Sociologija – mul'tiparadigmal'naja nauka? [Sociology is a multi-paradigm science?]. *Sociologicheskie issledovanija*, 2002, no. 7. – pp. 22-31.
- Valiev I.N., Sedov S.A. The actual status of the municipal educational environment. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 2016, Vol. 20, Special Issue 2, pp. 210-217.
- Marks K., Jengel's F. Kritika politicheskoy jekonomii (chernovoj nabrosok 1857-1858 gg.) [Criticism of political economy]. *Sochinenija*, 2-e izdanie. Tom 46. Chast' 1. 214 p.
- Frejd. Z. Psihologija mass i analiz chelovecheskogo "Ja" [Psychology of the masses and analysis of the human "I"], publishing house]. Moscow, izdatel'stvo "Sovremennye problemy" N.A. Stolljar, 1926.
- Frejd Z. Psihoanaliz. Religija. Kul'tura [Psychoanalysis. Religion. Culture]. Moscow, 1992.
- Valiev I.N. EDUCATION AS A PROCESS OF SOCIAL TYPES FORMATION. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences (MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy)*, July 2015, Vol. 6, No 4 S1, pp. 101-107.