

UDK 378.126

DOI: 10.23951/2782-2575-2022-2-15-41

PEDAGOGICAL EDUCATION AND SELF-DETERMINATION: REDEFINITION OF BOUNDARIES

Alexander A. Polonnikov, Natalya D. Korchalova

Belarusian State Pedagogical University named after Maxim Tank, Minsk, Belarus

Belarusian State University, Minsk, Belarus

Abstract. The initial thesis of this article is to consider the contemporary cultural situation as hyperdynamic, transterritorial, and formed by a multiplicity of mutually disproportionate worlds specifying a person's position in them, together with the totality of their inherent meanings, visions, relations, behavioral patterns and possibilities of self-determination. Such a situational definition is a challenge to established educational practice, prompting it to dynamize and diversify the connections and relationships at work within it and to reorganize the forms of educational semiosis and the sign-symbolic mediators that support them, including texts specifically designed to orient students.

After a critical evaluation of mapping as a constructive basis for the formation of students' orientation competence (leading to a discursive unification and homogenization of educational practices), the authors attempt to develop an instrument of orientation mediation that highlights the multidimensionality of pedagogical positions and is subject to several key requirements. These are as follows: Orientation to the qualitative differences in educational relations in the processes of pedagogical self-organization; abandonment of the position of an absolute subject with the ability to perceive the educational environment panoptically; the incorporation of the student's self-organization techniques that allow him/her to build moving and transforming coordinate systems and actions relevant to them in the orientation process.

The semiotic construction of the mediator, designed by the authors to ensure the variability of the configurations of educational reality, aims analytically, above all, to explain and differentiate the political images of the production of educational subjects in the minds of students. Therefore, each of these policies is considered a discursive construction aimed at establishing and reproducing a model of a certain anthropological type in the educational environment. This means that this environment is an area of symbolic struggle of different pedagogical forms, which necessarily involve the consciousness and self-consciousness of their bearers in their structure. Thus, their self-reference or self-referentiality becomes the basic condition for constructing and reorganizing orientation systems.

The form of mediation support for students' orientation proposed by the authors uses the fundamental distinction between humanistic (pedagogical, anti-pedagogical) and post-humanistic policies of the genealogy of educational subjects, emphasizing their ontological specificity and epistemological incommensurability. The design of the text is based on posthumanist (postmodernist) concepts in search of a positive educational project that "creates new possibilities for development" rather than on critical engagement with the dominant discourses in education. The authors' textual experiment raises a number of new research and practice questions, including those of textual exposition of ontologically heterogeneous forms of education, overcoming the effects of sign-symbolic reification of educational statements due to educational reproduction, clarifying the self-referential psychological and pedagogical conditions of the pedagogical self-determination subject.

Keywords: *educational semiosis, self-referentiality, plurality, counter-text*

The work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Belarus (Research # GR 20211214)

Introduction

Many would probably agree that the most salient goal of education, at least the liberal version, is to provide students with reliable “sailing directions” to help them navigate the complex and changing modern world.

The modern world of education, the subject of this paper, is no exception in this regard. On the one hand, teachers of pedagogical disciplines are increasingly confronted with the situation that it is impossible to “reduce to a common denominator” the diversity of pedagogical approaches. Yet, on the other hand, pedagogical publishing is teeming with sailing guides whose authors seek to provide their readers with thoughtful and scientifically sound ways to move forward in the flow of events but also to recognize the dangers and risks that young people entering professional and educational life may encounter along the way.

Developing such guidelines usually lies in theoretical and methodological disciplines (philosophy, sociology, psychology, and logic) that claim to be fundamental. However, it is worth noting that common sense can also serve as such a foundation. One of the goals of these guidelines is to create in students a holistic picture of the emergence and development of the branch of knowledge under study in the context of related sciences and practices.

It happens that in creating such an orientation scheme, voluntarily or involuntarily, a metaphor for map data is used, which, according to the authors, makes it possible to grasp the entire field of interest at a glance. Even when historical detail is used in creating a map, the retrospective inevitably relies on topology as the context that guides its development. These are the constructive foundations of the preliminary schematization of knowledge in education.

A map, as we know, is an established universal representation of territory that reflects landscape features and positions the user in a particular way. Those who can read it (indeed, the main efforts in education are aimed at teaching such a skill) acquire the necessary relatively stable vision and the life skills that go with it. Finally, a map is not just about marking an area; it is also a form of vision, i.e., support for shaping action.

Since all these knowledge carriers use the same representation, the metaphor of map data acts as a reliable mechanism of social identification and homogenization, contributing to the formation of an “educational identity.” Its most important feature is the perspective of the observer, whose actions do not affect the scale or landscape of the observed area in any way. Moreover, this observer must trust the map/knowledge, because doubts about its authenticity lead to disorientation and confusion. You may invoke the need to develop and even teach critical thinking in students, but you should in no way question the principle of mapping and the ideology of knowledge deposit¹.

The fact that a person’s position in the modern hyperdynamic and transterritorial² world cannot be represented in planar terms and, moreover, depends on his or her own orientation efforts is now increasingly being recognized by the educational community. It turns out that there can be more than one orientation scheme, and the differences between them are not merely scale- or object-related, but qualitatively and ontologically heterogeneous. In particular, this calls into question the principle of orientation based on a universally valid map. According to F. Jameson,

¹ The critical pedagogue P. Freire writes about knowledge as a bank deposit: “It is not surprising that, within the concept of the Bank, a person is seen as a malleable, controlled being. The more students work to preserve the deposits invested in them, the less they develop the critical thinking that might result from their interaction with the world as its transformers. The more abjectly they accept the passive role imposed on them, the more they tend to simply conform to the world that already exists and to the fragmented vision of reality that has been invested in them, as in a bank” [1, p. 47].

² The interpretation of trans-territoriality in this paper is a renaming of the well-known term in sociology Extraterritoriality by S. Bauman and means the weakening of the spatial factors of identity constitution and the delegation of the conditions of social control to communicative instances. “It no longer matters where the one who gives the orders is located; the distinction between “near” and “far” or between the wilderness and the civilized world, the organized space, almost disappears.” [2, p. 17].

the participation of an orienting person in the process of orientation “implies the practical conquest of a sense of place and the construction or reconstruction of a coherent ensemble that can be retained in memory and that an individual subject can re-map even as a function of mobile, alternative trajectories” [3, p. 166].

There is no doubt that humanists working on the navigation problem do much to avoid errors in planar representation. For example, some rely on the history of disciplines to solve the problem of orienting students in the growing epistemological diversity. They believe that “the history of the emergence and change of a scientific discipline is a valuable experience in overcoming the limitations of everyday consciousness as well as a source of ideas that provide support in a situation of epistemological uncertainty and value relativism” [4, p. 69].

The teacher should demonstrate (in person or through a particular text) a model of orienting behavior. The emphasis is on the teacher’s rhetorical art, that is, on his or her ability, first, to present the material in understandable and accessible language that avoids profanity, and, second, to impress students with fascinating material [ibid., pp. 72–73]. At the same time, it is assumed that the variability of presentation, i.e., what is said, is the necessary condition for learning orientation.

Meanwhile, as I. Gofman stated, it is not so important what the teacher says but from what perspective his/her text is implemented. In analyzing the lecture structure, Gofman writes: “A lecture is an institutionalized extended holding of the floor in which one speaker imparts his views on a subject, these thoughts comprising what can be called his Text. The style is typically serious and slightly impersonal, the controlling intent being to generate calmly considered understanding, not mere entertainment, emotional impact, or immediate action. Constituent statements presumably take their warrant from their role in attesting to the truth, truth appearing as something to be cultivated and developed from a distance, coolly, as an end in itself” [5, p. 165].

The speaker may be as critical as he likes of the subject of his message, but the truth of his position, the authority in whose name something is reported, must not be questioned. We should also consider the publicity of this message and its social purpose. The principle of order is conveyed and shaped in the consumer’s perception of orientation as an ontologically unified world. To put it figuratively, once thrown out the door, Unification has now climbed in through the window.

The creation of maps that aim at a two-dimensional representation of educational phenomena has the effect of neutralizing the ontological differences in educational relations precisely because of the spatial organization of this type. J. Derrida, in particular, draws attention to this point when discussing the question of the panoptic organization of knowledge. To illustrate his point, Derrida uses an optical metaphor – the Panorograph.

A panorograph is a device that allows the totality of objects intended for observation to be visible simultaneously. “Thanks to schematism and the more or less explicit introduction of a spatial dimension, we are able to observe [objects] on a plane and with greater freedom – a field that has lost its power... Thus, the terrain and outlines of structures become more visible when the content, that is, the living energy of meaning, is neutralized” [6, p. 10]. A panoptically organized text is a kind of panoramic image that solves the problem of holistic representation, eliminates ontological differences and multidimensionality, and makes the neutralized one-dimensionality the basis of the reader’s orientation.

In our opinion, one of the most successful attempts to design a text as a diversified description of educational reality comes from Professor Dorota Klus-Stańska from the University of Gdansk, Poland. The didactic space presented in her textbook is heterogeneous and heteronomous, inherently contradictory and dynamic. In D. Klus-Stańska’s picture of the educational world, “the

representatives of different paradigms attach different meanings to the observed events, and the application of the same concepts refers to differently explained phenomena. As a result, the theories become untranslatable for each other, and researchers remain in different worlds either way” [7, p. 39].

The text of the handbook mentioned above attempts to present education as a field of competing pedagogical strategies that cannot be reduced to a single, even abstract, entity. The book written by Klus-Stańska directly declares the goal of shaping students’ attitudes towards educational diversity, as it is addressed to “future teachers and educators oriented towards didactic theories and events taking place in the countries where academic reflection is developed and institutional forms of education are implemented” [ibid., p. 7].

At the same time, the perspective from which Klus-Stańska presents the pedagogical account remains largely traditional, outside¹ the didactic reality depicted, and tends toward an objective (unbiased) description. As a result, her representation of the text turns out to be paradoxical in itself. On the one hand, it creates a diversified educational landscape in which specific languages are used in each field. On the other hand, if we apply J. Derrida’s idea of neutralization to this textbook, a kind of objective perspective emerges from which a panoptic overview is possible. The instance of the semantic organization of representation disappears from the description that determines the text’s composition and intention².

The question can be formulated as follows: In the name of what authority does the author speak? And does this not mean that a change in the presentation perspective can sometimes radically alter not only the structure and content of the text but also the reading process itself? This gives rise to the unprecedented goal of making a statement with a moving and changing coordinate system that can bring an image ordered according to its rules to life in each of its versions. Yet, at the same time, each of them should be denied not only the right to their synthesis but even to their juxtaposition.

The search for a structure of a multidimensional text that exposes the heterogeneous elements and connects the exposure with the position of the only ordering reality is a problem with many unknowns that cannot even be formulated as a key question. The problem turns out to be multi-layered, and the removal of any one of the layers reveals new layers and associated questions rather than revealing the core of the phenomenon. That is why we have taken a purely practical approach in writing this text – we take a trial-and-error approach to our search, making progress where we can and looking for ways out in dead ends and places of great uncertainty.

This is how we arrive at the idea of Pure Experimentation based on an experiential activity – research through practice. The primary goal is to rehabilitate the technique known as the Hit-and-miss method. It is used when it is not possible to form a theoretical picture of a situation a priori, and it is necessary to act through experimentation and subsequently understand it. An American researcher of management problems, Bill Torbert, once tried to conceptualize the hit-and-miss method. He refers directly to a particular form of reflexivity inherent in action research, which stems from “commitment to an intention or the general concept (idea, vision of a problem) and attention to contradictions between concept, strategy, execution, and results... (leading, above all, to a sensitivity to change in oneself)” [10, p. 16].

¹ Outsiderness is a term coined by M. Bakhtin to denote the fundamental possibility of an esthetic position that makes it possible to see and create a whole image without bringing in the author’s subjectivity. Bakhtin considered outsiderness as the goal of constructing a certain position when analyzing a work of art. It means “the outsiderness of the author in relation to the hero, a loving removal of himself from the sphere of life of the main character, the purification of the whole sphere of life for him and his being, and the participation in the understanding and completion of the event of his life by a real-cognitive and ethically indifferent spectator [8, pp. 41–42].

² After all, as the French semiologist R. Barthes said, “By giving a name to this or that thing, I give a name to myself; I enter into the competition of the many different names” [9, p. 486].

Likely, navigation based on the recognition of the ontological and spatial plurality of educational worlds should exclude, at least as a basic assumption, the possibility of an external perspective and build an orientation text according to the rules of self-reference (above all, receptivity to change in oneself), which implies the explication of the structure of this perspective that creates a vision of educational reality consistent with it. The experience of creating such a multidimensional mapping is the central message of this article.

The structure of this article is as follows. First, we will name the educational ideology on the basis of which the order of orienting actions is built, as well as consider and evaluate this or other reconstructed educational orders. After that, we will try to describe (in a model way) several educational perspectives we are confronted with in an ontological conflict. The last part deals with the analysis of the results of the conducted text experiment, the formulation of the problems found in its implementation, the description of the results, and the principles for constructing a reality-diversifying text that seems clear and unambiguous at the moment.

Preliminary notes

In constructing a text that solves an orientation problem, as already mentioned, the coordinate system is of particular importance, the projection of which onto Locality produces its particular representation. Its construction involves a certain cultural and pedagogical arbitrariness. In other words, the point of view applied here is, first, precisely, the point of view and, second, only one of the possible perspectives. Arbitrariness implies recognition of the problem of deriving this or that position from a general principle and agreement with the fact that “it is possible to establish the objective truth of pedagogical influence through this logical *constructum*, which has neither a sociological nor a psychological reference” [13, p. 18].

Arbitrariness, according to French sociologists P. Bourdieu and J.C. Passeron cannot be understood as a simple voluntary act. Setting a starting point and thus setting oneself in motion means making a choice in a situation with many possibilities, finding oneself in a culture, and also “relating it to a multiplicity of cultures of the present or of the past, or projecting it onto the universe of possible cultures of the future” [ibid., p. 25]. Arbitrariness is also consistent with recognizing the practicality¹ of other educational choices, their subordination to other social and cultural choices, life programs, and professional positions. Our research strategy is consistent with the assumption of pluralism in educational programs and practices operating in the heterogeneous and heteronomous network of modern culture. Pluralism does not mean rejecting our educational values, but it is associated with certain self-restraint and rejection of self-universalization.

The arbitrariness also applies to the subject to become a figure that excludes or eclipses the other contenders for participation in the orienting game of education. In the case of our choice, this status has a Mysterious phenomenon called Identity, Personality, and Subject. All these and many other designations are a kind of euphemism whose discursive existence is related not only to the characteristics of their owners – the humanities – but also to the educational programs that prevail in a particular historical epoch and place. Dealing with them is both the content of educational practice and an area of irreconcilable cultural confrontation.

In other words: In this presentation, we *postulate* that “education is always connected with identity (personality) and is a site (tool, environment, mechanism) of its qualitative transformations. The image of the person, a model that has always guided educational practice, is

¹ By practice, according to A. McIntyre, we mean “any consistent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through which the benefits internal to this form of activity are realized in the course of attempts to apply those standards of excellence that are suitable for this form of activity and partly identify it with the result that human powers in achieving excellence are systematically expanded, as well as the corresponding concepts of goals and amenities” [14, p. 255].

the central link in the humanistic discourse of education, a necessary condition for the functioning of any educational structure” [15, p. 137]. Therefore, we focus on the image of the human being as the humanitarian core of any educational program, regardless of how consciously that image is deployed by the authority that holds it.

The orienting representation of educational practices described below is not the Truth but is employed as a specific educational structure to pluralize students’ perceptions of education. In this case, it acquires an instrumental meaning, and its evaluation is not subject to the criteria of reconstructive truth so much as to its conformity to the educational goals for which this reconstruction is intended.

The goal of constructing a text (a statement) that can trigger in its user (addressee) the effect of a differentiated perception of education requires, among other things, that the addressee adopt such a position that does not raise hopes of an ontological guarantee in the context of educational interaction. Alternatively, in other words, it requires such a view of the world in which it appears as a phenomenon of the constant creation of the world and the person who creates it. It is very likely that this view is best expressed in contemporary postmodern philosophy. The question arises as to what enables us to associate such hopes with this tendency of humanitarian thought.

We find the basis for such confidence in J.F. Lyotard, who provided the educational community with a postmodern definition of the sociocultural situation in his famous account of knowledge. His description of the state of postmodernity takes the form of a heteronomous and heterogeneous description that denies unity to the world and implies the impossibility of finding that absolutely stable position in culture from which the production of universally meaningful meaning is possible. According to Lyotard, “there is no reason to expect even the slightest reconciliation between the ‘language games’ that Kant called faculties, knowing well that they are separated by an abyss and that only a transcendental (Hegelian) illusion can hope for their totalization in a real unity” [16, p. 32].

The orientation implied in Lyotard’s text coincides with our experimental goal, which is to create conditions for students’ orientation in a situation of educational plurality. At this point, it should be noted only that for Western researchers, the situation of postmodernity is an essential feature of the present, while for education in the countries of Eastern Europe, a pluralistic project is only one of the possibilities. It follows that the use of postmodern discourse to solve our problems must be “tied to the locality,” as well as experimental and textual concretization.

The difference between the appeal to the postmodern statement in the logic of the Existing and the Due can be illustrated by the example of the work of one of the famous French researchers of modern education, J.-M. Lamarre. In his definition of the educational situation, Lamarre writes: “The school today is not so much an object of doubt and criticism, but of distrust and contempt from within, a particular kind of distrust that is not an intellectual quality (critical spirit) but arises from a lack of commitment and a desire to know... The distrust that prevails today is a silent distrust that is more a consequence of the postmodern processes of destroying familiar cultural relationships and bonds” [17, p. 91].

The above statement by Lamarre is quite conclusive. If we use the language of the Dutch intellectual historian Frank Ankersmit, it is constructed according to the rules of the so-called “narrative realism.” This technique refers to the text as an expression of an extralinguistic reality outside the text, which makes it possible to recognize the description as true or false. Narrative Realism is based on the visual metaphor of Paintings or Photographs, which proposes the possibility of verifying the correspondence “between photographs and paintings (in their totality and detail) and the fragments of visible reality depicted on them” [18, p. 118]. In this way, Lamarre creates a reality effect through which the author and the reader “believe together that

organized language is capable of reflecting, expressing, describing, revealing, or even recreating the real world, and that there is, after all, a real, structured, reasonably unified world that can be understood” [19, p. 252].

It is evident that Lamarre, with the help of narrative realism, not only describes the educational situation on the ground but, through his writing, establishes it as a fact in the reader’s perception. Of course, his French readers will have no doubts about the appropriateness of Lamarre’s text, and even in the case of some inconsistencies, the reader’s sense of reality, imperceptible to native speakers, will compensate for the inevitable gaps. In this case, however, we are more interested in the educational semiosis¹ effects produced by the use of the technique of narrative realism than in the consistency of the statement with reality. We believe that the realistic representation mode can produce hypostatic effects in the reader, which clearly contradicts the idea of diversified orientation.

However, even if we agree with Lamarre’s version of the situation in education and project it into the context of the Eastern European region, it will not be difficult to see the “availability of absence,” so to speak, of the signs of “distrust and contempt from within” noted by Lamarre. Criticism of education in our region, if any, is parametric in nature, calling for the optimization of certain features of the educational system (humanization of relations between teachers and students, strengthening the material base of educational institutions, improving the financial well-being of teachers).

In any case, the institution of education and what happens in it is perceived by its subjects in a reified² quality, and this circumstance implies, among other things, additional textual processing of the borrowed postmodern statement. We relate this change to implementing the principles of “narrative idealism.” The latter is based on the thesis that “we ‘see’... only through the masquerade of narrative structures (although behind this masquerade there is nothing that has a narrative structure)” [18, p. 130].

In our case, however, it is not only the narrative style that should be discussed. When Lamarre talks about education, he objectifies it (with or without intention). In other words, Lamarre’s signifier refers to the object of signification that constitutes its referential part. Such a voice speaks of education, of course, but not from within education. For the sign that is placed inside the education process radically changes the referential relation. It now corresponds to another sign denoting an event rather than an external object. In other words: When we speak of the use of the sign *From Within*, we refer to a specific sign transformation – a use that avoids direct designation.

The signs that come into play in education are forced into a kind of Self-Care. They are confronted with the need, according to Derrida, “to point out the conditions, circumstances, and limits of their efficacy by insisting that they belong to the machine they are capable of disrupting (*déconstituer*), and thus also to the gap through which shines a still nameless light that flickers on the other side of the fence (*clôture*)” [6, p. 128]. By addressing the process of pedagogical semiosis, deconstruction interrupts the automatism of the work of the sign and its semiotic connections by promoting their “postponement and at the same time their elimination (*differer*)” [*ibid.*, p. 140]. The pedagogical use of a sign, for we speak here of an intersign relationship, correlates with a systematic postponement of its use, with a constant search for a “detour” [22, p. 106].

¹ The educational semiosis in this article is interpreted, firstly, as an educational environment, and secondly, as a communicative relation that places statements and the interaction between signs associated with them in the focus of pedagogical attention. It is believed that the key in pedagogy is not the subjects of educational interaction, but the sign-symbolic formations used by them. Or, in other words, the educational semiosis in a practical sense means the key role of the regulation that “signs are everywhere, but they only impact us if we take notice of them in some way” [20, p. 292].

² “Reification is the perception of human phenomena as objects, i.e., in non-human and possibly superhuman terms” [21, p. 47].

In this respect, narrative idealism coincides with the ideology of self-referential judgment of the text. The idea of self-referentiality implies a shift of emphasis in word use and its analysis from the content of the statement to the conditions of its production, which in teaching is accompanied by the development of a linguistic self-consciousness associated with its participation in the constitution of meanings. Self-referentiality is related to the removal of “the connection of language with external circumstances and the appeal to itself (to the relationship between sign and language as an instance of a statement). Self-referentiality is the precondition for “the possibility of autonomous regulation of language practice, which should become a specific ethical message of the linguistic analytics of subject constitution” [23, p. 62].

The self-referential character of utterances makes it impossible to make judgments from the perspective of the Absolute Subject, since they seem related to cultural, social, professional, and communicative contexts. Moreover, self-reference is consistent with auto communication, the subject’s creative attitude toward his or her position, and the conditions that constitute the statement’s position. In a sense, self-referentiality means an optical doubling through which the author of the text traces both the subject context of the speech and the constituents on whose behalf the speech is realized. From this perspective, the voice belongs not so much to the author as to the culturally and situationally conditioned entity with which the speaker forms a temporal unity.

Creating a differentiating, orienting text also touches on the problem of otherness. First and foremost, it concerns what Lyotard has defined as the ability to “tolerate mutual disproportion” [24, p. 12]. However, it is appropriate to make the following remark here. Lamarre, like Lyotard, speaks of mutual incommensurability¹ as a kind of event in education and culture that has already taken place and determines positions in communication. Considering the presence of heterogeneity as the Existing of the educational situation, he discusses in this context the use of a text in the classroom. What is evident for him is the loss of integrity through education and the many ontologically heterogeneous forms that compete in it. In this context, the question of otherness arises for him, which he interprets in terms of the conflict of differences, which means that for education, among other things, a special kind of cultural mediator is important – texts and works that contribute to the development of the student because of their otherness (*altérité*) [26, p. 77].

Since these cultural mediators do not correspond to students’ experiences, they not only contradict them but also can cause “a trauma of astonishment, a trauma of an unknown and strange sense” (“traumatisme de l’étonnement,” “traumatisme du sens inconnu et étrange”) [*ibid.*, p. 77]. In other words, power in educational communication, according to Lamarre, is realized by artistic works and teachers “through themselves and their otherness (*altérité*)” [*ibid.*, p. 99].

Regarding education in the Eastern European region, the problem, in our opinion, lies not so much in the conflict of differences, which is typical of Lamarre’s experience, but in their creation. The educational practices currently prevalent in this region are characterized not so much by their discrepancies as by their surprising similarities. In our opinion, they are primarily due to the proximity of the social problems solved by the educational systems and are related to the fact that in them, the effects of homogenization and standardization are reproduced, which is expressed – at the level of educational practices – in the dominance of the tendencies towards conformity and the smoothing of contradictions.

From this point of view, otherness is marginalized by education, while homogeneity and monism are generally welcomed. Therefore, cultivating the value of otherness in educational relations, including the functioning of educational practices, serves as a blueprint for the possible

¹ Incommensurability is well known as an incompatibility that holds between scientific theories that seem to compete about the explanation of some type of phenomenon [25, p. 323].

future of the Eastern European region. That is, the differentiation of the perception of educational reality in the context of the mismatch between the worlds of human presence is an urgent problem that may still need to be solved by the national educational system. We connect its solution with the methods of mediation of texts in them. However, the nature of this mediation is determined by a particular pedagogical construction. We speak here about such an arrangement that causes the suspense effect (V.B. Shklovsky), which transforms what it perceives into the strange and surprising.

In order to solve the problem of orientation, which is more about the production of diversity than about its reception, we need, as already said, a specific semiotic construction, the creation of which we now begin.

As a basis for the specificity of educational reality, we will use the image of a person, with the help of which we will try to make the necessary distinctions. With the help of this orienting construct, we will begin to clarify the politics of the use of the image of a person in education, which includes both its particular interpretation and the related structure of education. This structure consists of two parts, which are not equally weighted: **humanistic** and **post-humanistic** projects. The former, in turn, consists of the *pedagogical* and the *anti-pedagogical* version. The latter is presented as a single block due to the indeterminacy of many designs. In our presentation, the humanistic orientation will start from the orientation to the certainty of the humanitarian ideal and the ways to its realization. On the other hand, the post-humanistic orientation will attack the idea of a model and expose it as part of a historically conditioned and problematic educational practice in the modern world.

1. The Humanistic Educational Project

1.1. The pedagogical formulation of this project can be related to the practice of purposeful development of the subject, which is connected with the public manifestation of the necessary future for the achievement of which pedagogical efforts should be made. From a posthumanist perspective, “it is a pattern based on a model, and therefore this pattern assumes that patterns and images are in some sense given, presented, and exist at least at an intuitive level for those who do pedagogical work” [27, p. 4].

The operation of pedagogical discourse is also actively supported by the psychological science that underlies it. Thus, L.I. Bozhovich, a disciple and follower of the Soviet psychologist L.S. Vygotsky, who shared these aspirations, considered that the goal of the humanities is “to create a specific pattern of behavior and activity of the child, to determine that complex of features of their personality toward the formation of which pedagogy should work precisely at [each] particular stage of the child’s age development” [28, p. 17].

In the language of this type of psychology, the pedagogical project can be defined as education or development. In American pedagogy, Benjamin Bloom, a well-known American psychologist in this part of the world, contributed to developing a humanistic pedagogical project. Bloom is known for presenting the developmental process as a hierarchically organized sequence (and subordination) of mental acts, including knowledge, understanding, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation [25, p. 18].

The development practice uses the models of intellectual progress in its construction, which “takes the form of irreversible changes... during which the system moves to a new level of functioning” [30, p. 5]. The achievements of the developing individual of the previous stage are absorbed into the structures of a higher order and begin to function therein according to the laws of the new whole (the idea of withdrawal).

At the same time, the development process is not disjunctive. That is, it is integral, which emphasizes the value of the unity of the humanitarian image model. In a Normal personality, according to the author of the idea of *non-disjunctionality* A.V. Brushlinsky, “the various stages, levels, components and aspects of such a process are not separated from each other like the elements of a mathematical set or the blocks of a machine; on the contrary, they are organically interconnected and interpenetrate each other” [31, p. 44]. Holistic consciousness is not characterized by contradictions and conflicts, which occur, if at all, only in transitional phases when development undergoes restructuring. During such restructuring, “the system is susceptible and sensitive to influences” [30, p. 13]. The principle of non-disjunctionality, as the posthumanists would say, excludes or pathologizes the heterogeneity of consciousness, its polycentricity, co-presence, and disharmony of qualitatively specific human states.

The structure of the pedagogical project includes the principle of deficiency, which complements the imperative of non-disjunction. It states that a student has a certain incompleteness that education must overcome on the way to a harmonious unity of the individual¹. The teacher’s gaze “should first be directed to the integrity of the human mode of being or of some kind of life activity” [32, p. 126]. Actually, the development consists in the elimination of the deficiencies that the student has.

The paradox, however, lies in the fact that the appearance of deficiencies in a pedagogical project precedes (or accompanies) their overcoming. A teacher, according to the French philosopher J. Rancière, a critic of the pedagogical project, is the one “who needs the incapable and not the other way around; it is he who constitutes the incapable as such. To explain something to someone is first to show him he cannot understand it by himself” [33, p. 11]. In other words, the formation of a student’s intellectual (or other) inadequacy is necessary for the formation of the teacher’s position. By organizing the development process, “the teacher establishes an absolute beginning: only then does the act of learning begin. But, on the other hand, the teacher lifts the veil of ignorance that he must lift about all things that are the object of study” [ibid.]².

As can be seen from Rancière’s observations, the strategy of guided development necessarily presupposes the asymmetry of the positions of the student and the teacher. What is meant here is the position in pedagogical communication necessary to solve didactic problems, not the correlation of human essences (although this is not uncommon in teaching practice).

A pedagogical project cannot be carried out outside the ideology of the teacher’s authority. In its structure, Christian anthropology is clearly oriented toward the imitation of the image of God. In its particularly extreme forms, its pedagogical version reduces to the duplication of the teacher’s personality and the hope of its continuation in the students³. The latter is consistent with a special pedagogical *responsibility* for the self-embodiment of the ideal. In analyzing its emergence, M. Foucault refers to the image of the shepherd. The pastor – the shepherd – ensures that all the sheep, without exception, are fed and safe. In his activity, Foucault distinguishes between two aspects: “First, he acts, works, and makes expenditures for his domestic sleeping animals. Second, he watches over them. He keeps a watchful eye on them all and never lets one out of his sight. He must know his flock, both in general and each animal. He must know not only the location of the rich pastures, the peculiarities of the seasons, and the order of things, but also the needs of each one.” [36].

¹ As the Russian psychologists E.I. Isaev and V.I. Slobodchikov write in this regard, “education” has the meaning of replenishing the individual to the universality of the human race, creating conditions for turning a person into a whole, real person, restoring the universal in a person” [32, p. 61].

² The Dutch psychologists who share the contexts of pedagogical strategy write that “students and teachers are the same in their human nature, but not in their concrete existence. Behind every discursive practice in teaching, there is not only integrity but also asymmetry” [34, p. 23].

³ An educator should be himself or herself what he wants to make of a student [35].

Over time, Christianity, oriented towards universalization and social unity has increased the importance of pastoral responsibility. Now “the shepherd must give account not only for each individual sheep, but also for all the actions of the sheep, for all the good and bad of which they are capable, for everything that happens to them. Even the transgressions of the sheep are imputed to the shepherd.” [36]. The responsibility of the shepherd becomes total. It is no longer enough for the shepherd to know the condition of the flock; he must also know the condition of each sheep. For this purpose, two tools are used: “the study of consciousness and the direction of consciousness” [ibid.]. The goal of a detailed study of the inner world of the Sheep stimulates the formation of psychological knowledge, which has as one of its sources the need for social control and regulation. From a posthumanist point of view, psychological science in education is an entity that tracks a student.

Summarizing this part of the analysis, we can conclude that the pedagogical project we are reconstructing turns out to be quite vulnerable from a posthumanist perspective. This vulnerability is due to the following:

a) The lack of an answer to the question of the developmental ideal, as different ideals, including mutually exclusive anthropological ideals, clash in multicultural and dynamic circumstances, inevitably leading to culture wars and other forms of struggle for dominance.

b) The weakening of the pedagogical monopoly of information, leading to a crisis of authority and, accordingly, to the teacher’s inability to control the symbolic boundaries of the educational situation and content.

c) The overvaluation of the cognitive factor in the development of the student leads to the devaluation of other forms of the orientation of the individual in the modern world (esthetic, practical, moral, and religious).

d) The inclusion of homogenization and unification in the discourse, as well as their subordination to the normative plan of development, which accordingly marginalizes the otherness, randomness, and heterogeneity of educational practices and their effects.

e) The dominance of the logic of progressivism in the development plans underlying the educational project makes the student hostage to the “need-to-be-future” and devalues the relevant needs and conditions of the student.

To defend against these charges, proponents of the pedagogical project accuse posthumanists of being unscientific, of depriving students of the experience of submission to authority that is important to their social lives, of students’ rejection of consistency and consequence, of irrationalism, of programmed social maladjustment and asociality, of depersonalization, and of pedagogical irresponsibility. In particular, it is argued that for posthumanists in education, “the process becomes more important than the product and communication more important than solving the problem” [37, p. 46] and that the posthumanist attitude leads to the defamation of “any universality-norms, rules, principles, and values” [ibid., p. 416]. According to the critics, the posthumanist image of man is “the image of a psychotic, a psychopathological personality whose life dissolves in a series of contradictory situations and does not follow a single line” [ibid., p. 420].

Currently, criticism of posthumanism is also directed against the new realities of life. Its proponents are accused of a lack of control and acquiescence to a situation where streams of information, often uncontrolled and unreliable, are poured into students. “Messenger and chat platforms offer a unique opportunity to create an infinite number of Simulacra that erase the facets of personification... leading to processes of destruction of the unified space of the world, its deconstruction and fragmentation, and resulting in a clip consciousness and a departure from the culture of theoretical knowledge” [38, p. 98].

“The clipping and fragmentation of thought lead to difficulties in logical cognitive operations such as analysis and synthesis. When children and adolescents immerse themselves in virtual reality, they gradually lose their sense of reality; moreover, the virtual world has more meaning and significance for them than the real world. When immersed in the realities of the objective world, students feel helpless in both communication and action situations” [ibid.].

Listening to these accusations, the posthumanists, strange as it may seem, agree with the sociocultural and psychological observations of their critics, but the conclusions are just the opposite. If uncontrolled streams of information are pelting students, then one should not adopt a protective posture but the other way around. In their view, information chaos is a new, unprecedented life challenge, so the answer to it cannot be found in the usual pedagogical schemes.

1.2. We will present the *anti-pedagogical version of the humanistic project* as an opposition to the pedagogical project. The origins of the anti-pedagogical position can be easily related to the humanistic ideas of J.-J. Rousseau [39, p. 112; 40, p. 80; 41, p. 10; 42, p. 61, among others]. It is well known, after all, that many of his works proclaim the child’s autonomy, the subordination of development to an inner law that an adult interacting with a child can only reckon with. In this context, the following theses of his teaching seem reasonable: “Let childhood mature in children; ... if a lesson becomes necessary for them, beware of giving it today, when you can confidently postpone it until tomorrow” [43, p. 233]. Of course, the world of children that Rousseau describes is not a preparation for future life, nor is it identical to an adult’s world. That is, it is qualitatively specific. And, of course, it cannot be understood from the opposite perspective, particularly from the fundamental determinations of pedagogically oriented cultural-historical psychology¹.

The main principle of anti-pedagogy is the postulate of the child’s natural development (the botanical metaphor Maturation is often used). Even parents do not have the right to impose this or that choice on the child. “Children are assumed to be capable of making fateful choices for themselves from the moment they are born. For each person is responsible only for himself” [45].

The imperative of the child’s world autonomy does not allow us to consider the child’s development in the context of socialization, which is understood as the transmission of cultural values and meanings to the developing individual. The term Enculturation is more characteristic of the anti-pedagogical discourse and emphasizes the activity of the individual himself or herself, who in the “cultural act... creates himself through culture and asserts himself as a person” [46, p. 34]. It is assumed that in the process of enculturation, each person creates his or her own unique image of the world. As a result, all people live in different worlds “in which rules of behavior are developed that are authentic to them, which means that “reality” falls apart and the classical model of education loses its obviousness since it is not known for which world the child should be prepared” [45]. Moreover, the value of the individual world of a growing person is equal to the world of the one who supports him/her in the course of their maturation.

In this respect, the most important context of the pedagogical project, the future, is disempowered in the anti-pedagogical promise and loses relevance. As a result, the pedagogical ontology takes on a *presentist* shape². Only the presence of the child and what happens “here and now” in the course of interaction with him or her matter.

¹ “Human anatomy,” L.S. Vygotsky and A. R. Luria quote Marx, “is the key to the anatomy of the ape. Allusions to the higher in lower species can be understood only if this higher is already known” [44, p. 27].

² *Presentism* is the theory of time according to which there are only real things and events, while the past and the future do not exist. In order to implement this thesis, it is necessary to control the use of language, since the tenses (past, present and future) are actively used in everyday language [42, p. 30].

In the anti-pedagogical educational project, according to the posthumanists, an anthropological legend is used, the core of which is the organic idea of self-development. The intervention of an adult may have some significance, but only in cases where there is an imbalance in the natural tendencies of self-realization or their blockage in the course of self-formation. In this context, the equivalence of the positions of an adult and a child in educational relations is proclaimed. The German antipedagogic theorist H. von Schönebeck generally presents it as friendship. He argues that our own and others' feelings are more important than ideas about what our friend "should" become. And we must respect the child's right to be who he or she wants to be. "We can be whomever we want to be, including children. The opportunity to "show one's true colors" is a great blessing based on trust and respect for new relationships" [48]. Trust and openness are the most important features of interaction in an anti-pedagogical project. Openness, in this case, is not understood as the possibility of the experience to be understood [49, p. 444] but as an essential feature of the interpersonal interaction between an adult and a child, as openness to the world, as trust in one's ability to establish new relationships with the environment [49, p. 453].

Within the anti-pedagogical approach, two versions can be quite clearly distinguished. The first, *logocentric*, can be illustrated by educational practices based on Piaget's genetic epistemology. It focuses on the intellectual component, which has a universal and transcultural essence. Through this program, an individualized subject is reproduced, which in the course of adaptation to environmental conditions at a certain stage of his/her development (the stage of formal operations), acquires the capacity for reflective self-determination, and becomes a full participant in social and cultural life. Clearly, this program, in the anti-pedagogical, logocentric version, is declared to be the law of mental life [50, p. 92].

The social interaction of a developed individual takes a distinctively decentered form, in which the position of another person is taken into account and, if necessary, a mutually beneficial compromise is found. From this perspective, decentering is important for establishing a relationship with another person and reflecting one's own position (in the mirror of that person). Of course, the other person's position at the level of formal operations is not identified with the position of the developing subject; however, it is assumed that fully developed communication participants have compatible coordinate systems.

The second anti-pedagogical version is most clearly represented in humanistic psychology and pedagogy, especially in the educational projects of the American psychologists C. Rogers and A. Maslow. In contrast to the European child-centered tradition, in which the mechanism of development is located in the mental space of the child and, according to J. Piaget, coincides with the experience of accommodation of cognitive structures, in the antipedagogy of Rogers and Maslow, the mechanism of individual transformations is focused on the affective experience of the child, his *values* and *feelings*.

In a critical evaluation of the discourse of the pedagogical project that focuses on abilities and skills that are external to the person, A. Maslow argues that all the content that is overrated for this field, "all these lengthy works on the psychology of learning, contain nothing essential, nothing vital, at least not for the human being, for the essence of man, for his soul" [51, p. 180]. In this context, "the goal of education and the object of education are the man himself and the humanistic goals, that is, those that correspond to the interests of man, and among them – the "self-realization" and "humanization" of man, the full embodiment of what a human being can achieve as a representative of a species, what the best representatives of humanity already possess. In less technical terms, the main goal of education is to help a person realize his or her full potential" [ibid.].

In the context of what Maslow wrote, the most important provisions for the anti-pedagogical project should be highlighted. First, it is a statement about the existence of a human essence that is subject to a Natural tendency to self-actualization. And secondly, it is the existence of a universal ideal, i.e., the image of a person, in the direction in which the development process should unfold. In other words, the question of the model is not excluded by the anti-pedagogical ideology but is Immantized and attributed to the inherent program of every human being, which, although rooted in each individual representative of the human species, is the same for all in its incarnation.

Since such antipedagogy postulates both the existence of human essence and the notion of education as a practice that corresponds to the interests of the student himself or herself, it makes sense to ask what this interest is all about. The answer lies with Carl Rogers, who believes that “behind every (mostly) superficial conversation lies the same basic, vital problem: ‘Who am I really? Will I ever be able to discover my true *Self*, or at least touch it? Will I ever feel certainty or consistency within myself?’ And these questions are asked by countless, not only young people but seniors as well” [49, p. 105].

The mystery of the *Self* needs no structural description. This is, as shown above, the privilege of the pedagogical project. The motivating basis of development, i.e., the mystery of the *Self*, has its potential mainly because it lures with its obscurity. The desire for self-knowledge is the motor of development, and its anticipation by adults is a justifying condition for adult Inaction. The development itself consists of “personal growth, in the fact that the individual can allow himself to immerse himself in the immediacy of what is felt, to strive to feel and clarify all the complex meanings of these experiences” [ibid., p. 402]. In fact, forming a new harmonious relationship with one’s experiences, and reorganizing the connections of the *Self* with the world and myself that have become inefficient, is anti-pedagogical self-actualization.

Summarizing the preliminary results, it can be said that the anti-pedagogical version of the humanistic approach to education does not deny the need for external participation in the development of students¹ but determines it through a set of axiomatics and reservations aimed at ensuring the maximum manifestation of the child’s own activity and creating conditions for equal communication between two (and more) subjects of education. At the same time, the assumption of the initial atomic subjectivity of the dialog partners is included in the list of axiomatics of antipedagogy, along with the manifestation of the “nature” and autonomy of childhood attributed to the development of the mechanism of self-knowledge, self-movement, and self-rehabilitation.

In the Eastern European educational space, the anti-pedagogical project opposes formalism and alienation, which, according to its adherents, are reproduced in mass pedagogical practice. Thus, the Russian humanistic psychologist A.B. Orlov, defending the idea of authenticity of the world of children from the expansion of the pedagogical project, writes that “the majority of school teachers and other practitioners of the public education system still adhere to the traditional (formative) pedagogical ideology; therefore, they (with or without intention) slow down the processes of positive transformations. As a result, both are deaf and blind to children’s individual experiences and inner world, i.e., to what psychologists call the child’s true (inner) *Self*” [53, p. 126].

In their argument with representatives of the posthumanist orientation in education, anti-pedagogues are primarily concerned with protecting the sovereignty of the individual and established ideals. Posthumanists, according to opponents, reject traditions, ignore generally

¹ “Antipedagogy does not fundamentally deny the necessity of an adult’s participation in a child’s developmental processes; however, its critique focuses on the most vulnerable component of the pedagogical project—the child’s inadequacy—and encourages the search for and reinforcement of moments that make it possible to mitigate or eliminate those conditions in educational relationships that diminish the potential for autonomy and freedom of the person being educated” [52, p. 570].

accepted rules, and neglect scientific data. They employ two main techniques in their struggle: discursive exclusion (ignoring, devaluing, demonizing) and neutralization. In the first case, the posthumanist educational orientation is either not mentioned at all or presented negatively. In particular, it is claimed to attack the natural foundations of identity, threaten the Great Synthesis of knowledge, and negate a positive developmental agenda [54, p. 381]. It is also accused of lack of scientificity, analytical superficiality, and incorrectness when it wants to “talk about scientific theories of which there is at best a vague impression” [55, p. 11]. The proponents of the anti-pedagogical project do not accept the posthumanist thesis that asserts “the dissolution of the subject in the processuality of discursive practices” and the randomness of its *Self* [56, p. 90].

In the case of neutralization, the posthumanist point of view is removed from the political and educational context and appears as a system of ideas, i.e., as the subject of the so-called Weighted criticism (on the one hand, on the other hand...). It turns out that the posthumanist vision excessively “relativizes moral values and norms and rejects priorities and clear guidelines,” but at the same time, it contains elements of positivity because it recognizes cultural polyphony and the possibility of a real dialog; it frees it from dogmatism and emphasizes the radical pluralism of language games [57, p. 66].

In their opinion, the characteristics that its critics attribute to the posthumanist educational project make it totally unsuitable for solving educational problems and developing perspectives for educational research [58, p. 223].

Despite many other disagreements, in this respect, the positions of the two representatives of the pedagogical and anti-pedagogical projects are in complete agreement. According to the Polish philosopher of education, T. Szkudlarek, “it is not even conceivable for pedagogy to turn to the discourse of postmodernism, not to problematize and challenge development, but to create new possibilities for development” [59, p. 84].

2. The Post-humanistic Educational Project

We will consider the post-humanistic educational project (which we associated in the introduction with the philosophy of postmodernism) primarily in the context of its attack on the holy of holies of humanist education, i.e., the category of “humanism.” The politics of the *Self*, which expresses the essence of the humanist project, corresponds to the anthropocentric stance, as mentioned earlier. And although this orientation is realized in different ways in its two versions (the pedagogical one goes down to the student, shaping his/her internal psychological conditions, and the anti-pedagogical one goes out from them), the hope that the child can eventually become Master of Themselves unites these two versions.

The view of the human being that is consistent with the posthumanist view is often presented as non-anthropocentric humanism. The proponents of this perspective consider the crisis and even the death of the subject in the form of its cultural symbolization, in which it has historically developed, as the condition that produces it. In the first place, it is a question of exposing the illusion of subjectivity begun by S. Freud. It is already important for our analysis that “the idea of the Death of the Subject was in sharp contrast with the subject-centrism of the first half of the 20th century (phenomenology, existentialism, hermeneutics, humanistic Marxism)” [60, p. 57].

Considering the human being from the perspective of the processes taking place in modern culture, from a posthumanist point of view, allows us to see the limits of the humanist program since the new situation of human life activity reveals this life activity itself as a cultural structure and problematizes its fundamental components (subject/object; nature/culture; personal/social; internal/external). It also reveals the illusory character of the humanistic idea of human domination over the world.

The Polish methodologist E. Domańska says: “The ongoing discussion within the framework of the new humanism about human essence, otherness and exclusivity increasingly concerns non-human existence – animals, plants and things. The *Other* is no longer just someone who is different from us in terms of race, gender, class, or sexual or religious options, but someone who can be any this/that/that, i.e., someone who is different from us in terms of species and/or organic (in the sense of, e.g., inorganic life)” [61, p. 11]. According to her interpretation, this kind of revision of descriptions of reality is not the result of an intellectual fashion and the cognitive curiosity of avant-gardists. However, it arises from the realization that the usual ways of thinking about the world do not correspond to the changes that are taking place in it (genetic engineering, transplantology, psychopharmacology, and nanotechnology) [ibid., p. 12]. In the context of non-anthropocentric humanism, “the non-human (animals, machines, and plants) is granted agency and subjectivity” [62, p. 140].

In humanitarian thought, “the notion of the human as a complex being rooted in an environment whose relationship to others is not obvious and who is subject to careful analysis and critique is increasingly affirmed. This is related, among other things, to the discovery that humans are involved in many different systems, processes, and events, a hodgepodge of forces and forms of existence” [63, p. 10]. For example, the boundary between the human and the non-human proves problematic from its marking point of view. M. Chutorański describes the following paradox: “The bacteria that live in my body, which I call mine, poison it and cause various changes in it or are simply neutral – is that a part of me? Or is the neoplasm that I want to destroy with the help of chemotherapy, doctors, and people close to me a part of me, or is it something foreign to me that I want to kill?” [ibid., p. 11].

The non-anthropocentric perspective of education refuses to reduce it to interpersonal interactions or individual situational receptions. “Education is much more than the intentions of teachers and the curiosity of children; it is a particular relationship that connects participants in space and time: in a particular classroom, in a courtyard, in a factory... they are specific networks in which something more than one person acts. We must recognize that every learning interaction is local, but it can create both longer and shorter networks. When the networks are very long, the relationship stabilizes... and there is a structural effect” [64, p. 141]. The latter does not mean the implementation of the popular opinion in pedagogy that “everything educates.” It merely follows from the non-anthropocentric concept that “we must constantly strive to understand how many entities participate in the educational event, how they become educational actors. And how many participants are set in motion by education” [ibid.64, p. 144].

The non-anthropocentric definition of the situation confronts education with a series of unprecedented questions, one of which is the principle of anthropocentrism itself. The possibility of the Self dominating itself and the surrounding circumstances thanks to the reflexive efforts of the individual, as the humanists believe, loses its fundamental status in post-humanistic discourse, since the individual is considered as one and, at the same time, not the most significant part of the process of personal identity.

The posthumanist critique focuses primarily on the ideology of the true *Self*, which is popular in education. Education that accepts this attitude becomes a condition for stabilizing the educational situation, while the task of education is to model instability and uncertainty. The thesis of the anti-pedagogues about openness is no less sharply judged. This is especially true for interpersonal relations. The interpretation of openness as access to the inner world of another and the interpretation of closeness as a personality defect can, according to the posthumanists, lead to the enforcement of conformity on the one hand and to the legitimization of social control on the other.

In conjunction with the idea of a true *Self*, openness transforms education into a psychotherapy session. As a result, according to the posthumanists, a humanitarian program is implemented that is no less socially ethical than a pedagogical project but is covered with a mask of goodwill and mutual trust. As the American posthumanists, R. Usher and R. Edwards write: “In the educational field, the person-centered or student-centered curriculum, although apparently centered on the intrinsic characteristics of the learner and the rightness of students making decisions about their own learning, actually works to increase the efficiency of the ‘learning system’. In other words, despite the stated rationale of students taking control of their own learning, the emphasis is on cost-efficiency, ‘value for money’ and more efficient regulation through engaging students directly in a supposedly democratic process of participation – a process, however, which is empty of ‘empowering’ content and centered on adaptation” [65, p. 45].

However, the main criticism of the posthumanists that is constantly reproduced in humanistic discourse, namely that the posthumanists (“and the postmodernists who have joined them”) lack a positive educational project, does not stand up to scrutiny. This applies to the teleology of the posthumanist orientation and its technological structure. Since the limited scope of the article does not allow us to present its provisions in more detail, we will briefly explain them point by point.

2.1. The Teleology of the Posthumanist Educational Project

Since in the posthumanist discourse, the sovereign inner world of an individual is revealed as a place of competition between different (even anonymous) forces, some of which act as products of artificial intelligence, the most important condition for the liberalization of the human being is the individual’s ability to discover and to recognize himself or herself as a derivative of the cultural practices, life programs, information flows, and cultural mediators (texts, images, and symbolic organization) that dominate his consciousness. By these Objects, we mean those that have both external and internal status. For example, the values conveyed by the mass media are perceived by their consumers as their own desires, which testify to the existence of a True *Self*. From this point of view, the content conveyed by education is not fundamentally different from the messages of mass media or the influence of social networks. All these and some other cultural and educational factors require a response at the pole of identity, which, in the face of a multiplicity of influences, is transformed into a structure of Operational Response, a position that an individual assumes in the communication processes of a heterogeneous environment.

From this definition of a cultural situation emerges an unprecedented problem for education – modeling the conditions of a plurality of forms of knowledge in which participants in educational interactions are immersed in a polyphonic environment, experience themselves under the conditions of epistemological and linguistic relativity, reveal the practical rootedness of any discourse, as well as objectify the connection of a particular position (one’s own and another’s) and discursive (communicative) power. “Meanwhile, the cognitive field of knowledge as an object loses its integrity (which has already become a myth of epistemology), but at the same time, it develops into a certain mosaic of necessary knowledge that reflects the idea of heterogeneous integrity possible in the educational experience of each subject (student)” [66, p. 88].

In the post-humanistic educational project, the *Self* of a participant in educational interaction loses its status of psychophysical self-identity common in traditional education and becomes a *Self*-illusion. What is meant is the emergence of a new “hero” in educational communication, i.e., the discursive *Self* is a communicative construction.

In the humanistic tradition, an utterance (gesture, movement) is firmly linked to the individual who produces it and is subject to the imperative of responsible speech. In other words, there is no

distance between speech production and the content or form of the utterance. Moreover, distance usually implies a lack of authenticity and sincerity in communication. In this case, a playful, ironic judgment that reveals an attitude toward its subject and the conditions of its expression has every chance of being suppressed by a teacher who controls communication or by a learning group. And even if not, the speaker will be forced to ask himself the question: What are you thinking right now? For in humanistically oriented practices, this kind of appeal is justified and conceptualized because the existence of a particular *Self* is assumed that gives rise to a thought and controls the form of its expression.

The post-humanistic perspective¹ that brings the discursive subject onto the educational scene corresponds to the need to “distinguish” between the subject in discourse and the subject (individual) in itself. In the logic of discursivity, the continuity and self-identity of the student are broken. In the language of E. Husserl we can speak of a kind of exception that takes the circumstances of the psychophysical individual out of the bracket and deprives them of their effectiveness. “The gap between the subject-in-itself and the discursive subject is an indicative event relation, an act of education” [68, p. 48].

The distance created by this act becomes a condition for the individual to experiment with the position of his/her statement as with the organization of the current interaction. “Within the framework of a single discourse... the subject is insignificant, it is subordinated to the discourse and plays by its rules (i.e., it is secondary)” [66, p. 88].

In this case, the discursive educational identity functions as a linguistic (textual) position or as “the effect of interventions that enable the subject to identify itself in the short term” [69, p. 346]. From this follows the specification of the practice of the self-relation of the discursive subject. In this case, it is not a matter of cultivating the narcissistic attention of the student to him/herself or the individualization of learning, which presupposes that the teacher understands the characteristics of “the student’s knowledge (private, public) and the characteristics of his/her interests for the realization of a mutual understanding” [70, pp. 324–325].

The discursive position of the student implies the implementation of the model of “practice of the self” in teaching, which is based, first, on a special self-relation, “not-*Self*.” This self-relation, as mentioned before, is based on the fact that the statement does not belong to the participant but to the communicative position. Secondly, it allows self-experimentation with emergent positions for theoretical identifications and playing the related perspectives.

The above list of new educational goals leads to rethinking the logic of development in education. The latter is now consistent with subjective transformations in education that return the subject to itself and are based on “the metacognitive application of critical thinking that transforms an acquired frame of reference—a way of thinking or worldview with orienting assumptions and expectations that include values, beliefs, and concepts—by evaluating its epistemic assumptions” [71, p. 124].

2.2. The Praxeology of the Post-humanistic Project

In contrast to humanistic education, which focuses on the internalization of the content of culture or the exteriorization of the structures of the inner world, the content of interaction in post-humanistic education is determined by the ideology of deconstruction, which we have already briefly discussed above. The invocation of this practice is primarily due to considerations of symbolic redundancy, which is specifically modeled in the educational setting. This circumstance exacerbates the problem of orientation in this environment, which becomes more

¹ A discursive subject is a concept that describes the position of a participant of an educational interaction in which he is faced with the need to “take care of the integrity of such model of his “Self”, which enables him to reassign the statement in the acts of making an identification of “Self” with his speech” [67, p. 175].

important through the analysis of the structure of symbolic mediators, their connections, and dynamic changes in the course of their application. The latter is particularly important due to the constraints that program the individuals. As a result, deconstruction in education is seen as “a strategy of immanent critique built into a given cultural code...that helps to distance the analyzed subject “from within” [59, p. 132].

The task of deconstruction in the post-humanistic project is to ensure that dealing with statements circulating in the situation of learning “makes it possible to breathe a new spirit into ossified thinking, to dereify events that have become obvious and objective, as well as to revive the discourse and the schemes of thought operating within it and to gain a different perspective on what seemed to be known/cognized” [72, p. 299]. The practice of deconstruction makes the sign (image, symbol) the main subject of education. The deconstructive operation with a sign means an attack on the usual understanding of the sign as a “trace” of meaning and asserts its secondary character and representative status. The deconstructive operation “involves a revision and envelopment of the traditional structure of the sign (signifier/signified), when the signified here loses its dominant position” [22, p. 118].

However, the semiotic transformation in the course of deconstruction is not only connected with the reversal of the established connection between the signifier and the signified. In its course, overcoming the so-called “metaphysics of the presence of human being in the world of language” [ibid., p. 50] is no less critical. Here it is about the experience of distancing a student from language, teaching him/her to consider it not only as an expression of inner human states but also to make him aware of the nature of linguistic functioning, its rules, and its productivity in relation to group and individual relations.

In specifying the methods of deconstructive experience, posthumanists also mention specific rhetorical techniques, including the dismantling of a conversation, i.e., loosening. This makes it possible to make the interlocutor’s position unstable and indeterminate, to move it away from the Dead Point and to rock it... [73, p. 11]. Loosening, according to Polish philosopher Łażewska, at the pole of the learner leads to “...confidence that nothing can be said with full certainty” [74, p. 168].

The creation of “double oppositions” can also be attributed to a series of deconstructive techniques that enable the identification of Indistinctions present in the text [59, p. 135]. Here, the aim is to create “counter-texts,” that is, texts with an alternative structure of meanings that explode the metaphysical vision of the world and affirm innocence” [ibid., p. 138]. The counter-text, in this case, is not a “meta-text” because “the deconstructive thought cannot be realized above the text; it is woven into the meanings of the primary text, extending and moving it, creating an intertextual relationship that makes it possible to recognize the ‘semantic violence’” [75, pp. 40–41]. The use of counter-texts leads to a focus on awareness of “textual literacy” in the sense of “understanding cultural messages, cultural texts, and the mechanisms for their production and dissemination” rather than the acquisition of “positive knowledge” [59, p. 138].

The peculiarity of the use of deconstruction techniques in education lies primarily in the fact that, as a field of instruction, they are accompanied by an “epistemological transformation” for the participants in the pedagogical interaction, i.e., a change in the student’s attitude toward knowledge. Here, it is about the formation of the student’s attitude towards the fact that knowledge is “produced,” that it is not synonymous with truth: knowledge is a text produced by someone under certain circumstances, and to some extent, it carries a cognitive perspective, depending on the conditions for its creation... Therefore, teaching should encourage the student to a) deconstruct the meanings circulating in communication, b) critically transform his or her knowledge, and c) deconstruct the educational process... The goal of the third phase is to prevent the limitation of

the critical attitude...; that is, the results of deconstruction should not be absolutized as a New Truth that replaces the Old Truth... This critical epistemological attitude toward knowledge as a process involved in specific social situations becomes not only a source of deconstructive teaching, but also its result” [59, pp. 131–132].

Conclusion

As mentioned in the introduction, this work was a text experiment to create such an explanation to help students interested in educational structures to at least somewhat navigate when a reliable objective educational map is not possible. Moreover, in the course of the experimental work, many problems related to the implementation of the claim to the generality of the created explanatory mechanism were discovered. They concern, first, its dependence on the position and actions of the person performing an act of educational self-determination, and second, the connection of this design with the conditions of education, in which orientation takes place exclusively in artificial circumstances that bear little resemblance to the realities of surrounding life, and not on sight.

In the first respect, the orienting statement can be associated more with the position of a stalker who wanders with his/her companions each time through unexplored territory than with the activity of a guide who presents a cultivated landscape to his/her followers. The stalker is not sure of his/her knowledge of the path nor of the clarity of the intentions of those he or she accompanies. However, the certainty of choice is also not characteristic of his/her fellow travelers. Moreover, a student at the beginning of his/her professional training and the young specialist he or she will be after training are not linked by genetic continuity. Moreover, this means that the orientation mechanism in the educational environment cannot be permanent.

In view of these and some other challenges, we decided to abandon the mapping ideology in constructing an orientation structure and chose to be guided by considerations of a different nature. For example, constructing an objective image of educational status is impossible in principle. But, in that case, this does not mean that it is impossible to undertake a journey together with fellow travelers, like a stalker, whose outcome is the experience of the journey rather than patterns of movement that might prove inappropriate in the future. The only question was what kind of experience that might be.

In creating our text experiment, we started from the fact that prospective teachers’ perceptions of the educational situation are loaded by their previous stay in educational institutions. D. Klus-Stańska writes in this context: “Everyone who has ever had a school experience has an imposed idea of what learning is and how it happens, and this idea strengthens the uncritical trust in the results of the research conducted in such a school, which is considered to be the only possible one. However, the coincidence of completely different Versions of teaching and learning with completely different images of school makes it possible to discover that what we thought was the essence of learning processes is only one of the possibilities and that the patterns considered universal have been created by the conditions in which we are stuck” [7, pp. 18–19].

The School Heritage concerning education, multiplied by the group conformity of the educational participants, leads to the fact that the student’s perception of the educational situation is subject to Schütz’s social Law, which deals with the coincidence of relevance systems and the interchangeability of their receptive perspectives. As a result, education appears in the minds of the participants as homogeneous and homonomous and is reproduced in this capacity.

To break the reproduction cycle means to see the educational situation as a site of symbolic struggle between pedagogical politics, a clash of anthropological practices, and a contradiction of humanitarian images. This is the problem that the indicative scheme we have developed is

primarily intended to solve. In this case, the receptive device we are testing is a pedagogical tool that aims to diversify (or facilitate) the perception of its user. And for this, it is important not only to show the difference but also to help students see the emergence of these differences as the product of the actions of a variety of people interested in their approval.

To this end, we developed a semiotic perceptual differentiator that juxtaposes images of humanistic and post-humanistic educational practices to create a basic distinction between educational forms, positioning educational objectivity and identity differently each time. Humanistic practices were presented in two versions: pedagogical and anti-pedagogical. The latter appeared in intellectualist and emotionalist forms. They were oriented to different psychological conditions as the basis for the organization of pedagogical action, but still coincided in their focus on the personality of the student, and with their help, solved the problem of stabilizing the student's position as the top priority of education.

In contrast to the humanistic educational project, the post-humanistic project, from whose perspective we were going to write this paper, abandoned the idea of a stable and centered identity and presented it as a particular kind of discursive construction, that is, as the standpoint of the participants in educational communication. This point of view was consistent with the statements (texts) made during the training with which the users were performing short-term identifications.

However, apart from the above results, our experiment also revealed a number of previously unnoticed research problems. These include the following:

– *Difficulties in the Spatio-temporal reorganization of the orienting action and the orienting text associated with it.* We are speaking here of the need to overcome the common notion according to which the orienting action (as well as the orienting text) helps to solve the problem of multiplying the effectiveness of the activity by, first, creating a panoptic illusion of the action (since, it is assumed, through it “the general outlook of the forthcoming action, the content of each of its links, as well as their sequence and the connection between them” [78, p. 44], is opened up and the student “will inevitably arrive at the predetermined results” [78, p. 40]), and second, by providing the acting subject with a cognitive economy (for “the preparatory orientation... to the typical features of the subject under study is psychologically important for the formation... from the very beginning of a generalized knowledge that allows to effectively master specific and diverse material without getting lost in its details and particulars and without spending too much time in understanding them” [79, p. 297]). The action research that served as the methodological basis of this textual research can be understood as the key idea of the educational rather than a didactical reinterpretation of orientation – its shift to the students' searching activity from a condition that precedes pedagogical self-determination (through its implementation as a result of this type of activity) to the support of the preconceived idea that the students themselves shape the means of orientation as the main content of pedagogical education.

– *The complexity of the representation of ontologically heterogeneous forms of education is due to the inclusion of orienting statements in a single narrative, which reduces polyspatial diversity to monospaciality.* In this context, the research focuses on the narrative form of the indicative text, a problem that can be solved by using hypertext structures in its organization. “The essence of hypertext is the multiplicity, the infinity, and the dynamism of the connections of units of knowledge, i.e., of concepts, quotations, images, and theories, i.e., of all elements that can be related in some way to the text being read. At any moment, the user can Jump to the moment related to the given text and start reading a new unit, from which he or she can continue indefinitely. Hypertext is a Perfect Encyclopedia, especially because the verbatim nature of its implementation seems to destroy its core idea: it is not a book and, therefore, cannot (and never will) lead to definitive knowledge. It is too changeable and dynamic for that” [80, p. 103].

– *Difficulties caused by the qualitative peculiarities of the indicative text itself, expressed in its own status dynamics.* In one case, the signs used in the orientation process are realized as semiotic forms that refer to other signs and are therefore potentially meaningful; in the other case, their meaning is determined exclusively by regulative goals, i.e., by action values that indicate the need to change perspective or to switch from one reading mode (perception) to another. The indeterminacy of these circumstances inevitably requires a series of studies in the field of pedagogical semiology with the subsequent creation of an appropriate sign-symbolic typology. The latter becomes an indispensable tool that can provide orienting solutions. The experience of such developments is available, for example, in modern micro ethnography, when studying communicative operators, that is, contextualization signals denoting the action by which one of the participants establishes one or another version of the situation for the other [81, p. 131].

– And finally, *a series of questions dealing with the educational application of the orienting statements.* As we can see, the statements (texts), which organize and guide the students' movement in the educational environment, are insufficient at this stage since they all acquire meaning only when the students carry out the movement. It follows that it is necessary to develop specific pedagogical tasks that stimulate student activity and find pedagogical techniques that support them. Keep in mind that the deconstructive procedures we briefly discussed above are primarily aimed at breaking the habit of students' perception of education. This means that the methodological solutions should consider students' resistance to the deconstructive effects.

References

1. Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (2018). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 50th Anniversary Edition* (4th ed.). Bloomsbury Academic. (Russ. ed.: Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogika ugnetyennyh* [*Pedagogy of the Oppressed*]. Moscow: KoLibri, Azbuka-Attikus, 2018). (In Russian).
2. Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity* (1st ed.). Polity. (Russ. ed.: Bauman, Z. *Tekuchaya sovremennost'* [*Liquid Modernity*]. St. Petersburg: Piter Publ., 2008). (In Russian).
3. Jameson, F. (1992). *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Post-Contemporary Interventions). Duke University Press. (Russ. ed.: Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernizm, ili Kul'turnaya logika pozdnego kapitalizma* [*Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*]. Moscow: House of the Gaidar Institute Publ., 2019). (In Russian).
4. Guseva, E. A., Panfilova, M. I. (2019). K diskussii o vuzovskoj filosofii: chto, kak, zachem [To the Discussion on Academic Philosophy: What, How, and What for]. *Vyshee Obrazovanie v Rossii* [Higher Education in Russia], 2, 69–78. <https://doi.org/10.31992/0869-3617-2019-28-2-69-78>. (In Russian).
5. Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk (Conduct and Communication)*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
6. Derrida, J., & Spivak, G. C. (1998). *Of Grammatology* (Corrected ed.). Johns Hopkins University Press. (Derrida, J. *O grammatologii* [*Of Grammatology*]. Moscow: Ad Marginem, 2000). (In Russian).
7. Klus-Stanska, D. (2018). *Paradygmaty dydaktyki. Myslec teoria o praktyce* [Didactic paradigms. Think theory about practice]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN. (In Polish).
8. Bakhtin, M. M. (2000). *Avtor i geroj: K filosofskim osnovam gumanitarnykh nauk* [Author and Hero: Toward the Philosophical Foundations of the Humanities]. Azbuka. (In Russian).
9. Barthes, R. (1994). *Izbrannye raboty. Semiotika. Poetika* [Selected works. Semiotics. Poetics] (Russ. ed.). Progress; Univers. (In Russian).
10. Torbert, B., Cook-Groot, S., Fisher, D., Fuld, E., & Goldier Et Al, A. (2018). *ACTION INQUIRY The Secret of Timely and Transforming Leadership* (Chinese Edition) (1st ed.). Publishing House of Electronics Industry. (Russ. ed.: Torbert, Bill. *Issledovanie dejstviem* [*Action Inquiry*]. Moscow: Mann, Ivanov and Ferber, 2019). (In Russian).
11. Lacan, J. (1966). L'instance de la lettre dans l'inconscient ou la raison depuis Freud. *Écrits*. (Russ. ed.: Lacan, J. *Instanciya bukvy, ili sud'ba razuma posle Frejda* [The instance of the letter, or the fate of the mind after Freud]. Moscow: Logos, 1997). (In Russian).

12. White, H. (1973). *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (1st ed.). The Johns Hopkins University Press. (Russ. ed.: White, Hayden. *Metaistoriya: istoricheskoe voobrazhenie v Evrope XIX v.* [Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe]. Yekaterinburg: UralGU Publ., 2002). (In Russian).
13. Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J.-C. (1970). *Reproduction: éléments pour une théorie du système d'enseignement* (ed. 1re) [Reproduction: elements for a theory of the education system]. MINUIT. (Russ. ed.: Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J.-C. *Vosproizvodstvo: elementy teorii sistemy obrazovaniya* [Reproduction: elements for a theory of the education system]. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 2007) (In Russian).
14. MacIntyre, A. C. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (F First American Edition). University of Notre Dame Press. (Russ. ed.: MacIntyre, Alasdair C. *Posle dobrodeteli: Issledovaniya teorii morali* [After virtue: A study in moral theory]. Moscow: Akademicheskij Proekt; Yekaterinburg: Delovaya kniga, 2000). (In Russian).
15. Polonnikov, A. A. (2002, October). *Obrazovanie i identichnost'* [Education and identity]. *Vuzovskaya nauka, promyshlennost', mezhdunarodnoe sotrudnichestvo* [University science, industry, international cooperation], 137–142. (In Russian).
16. Lyotard, J. (1993). *Le postmoderne expliqué aux enfants. Correspondance, 1982–1985* [The postmodern explained to children. Correspondence, 1982–1985]. Le Livre de Poche. (Russ. ed.: Lyotard, Jean-François. *Postmodern v izlozhenii dlya detej: Pis'ma: 1982–1985* [The postmodern explained to children. Correspondence: 1982–1985]. Moscow: RSHU Publ., 2008). (In Russian).
17. Lamarre, J. M. (2007). *La croyance en l'école à l'épreuve de la post-modernité: peut-on apprendre sans faire crédit au maître et à la culture enseignée ?* [Belief in school put to the test by post-modernity: can we learn without giving credit to the teacher and the culture taught?]. *Recherches En Éducation*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.4000/ree.3713>
18. Ankersmit, F. R. (1983). *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language*. Springer. (Russ. ed.: Ankersmit, Franklin R. *Narrativnaya logika. Semanticheskij analiz yazyka istorikov* [Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language]. Moscow: Ideya Press, 2003). (In Russian).
19. Goffman, E. (1981) *Lecture. Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, 160–196 (Russ. ed.: Goffman, E. *Lekciya* [Lecture]. *Akademicheskaya lekciya: prepodavanie i issledovanie* [Academic Lecture: Teaching and Research]. T. V. Tyagunova, A. A. Polonnikov (eds.). Belarusian State University, Minsk, 222–253). (In Russian).
20. Campbell, C. (2018). *Educating Semiosis: Foundational Concepts for an Ecological Edusemiotic*. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 38(3), 291–317. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-018-9617-4>
21. Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Anchor. (Russ. ed.: Berger, Peter L., Luckmann, Thomas. *Social'noe konstruirovaniye real'nosti. Traktat po sociologii znaniya* [The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge]. Moscow: Academia-Center; MEDIUM, 1995). (In Russian).
22. Gurko, E. (2001). *Dekonstrukciya: teksty i interpretaciya. Derrida J. Ostav' eto imya (Postskriptum). Kak izbezhat' razgovora: denegacii* [Deconstruction: texts and interpretation. Derrida J. Leave this name (Postscript). How to avoid the conversation: denegations]. Ekonompress. (In Russian).
23. Ratajczak, M. (2018). *Podmiot jako efekt języka* [Subject as an effect of language]. *Archiwum Historii Filozofii i Myśli Społecznej* [Archive of the History of Philosophy and Social Thought], 63, 35–62.
24. Lyotard, J. (1979). *La Condition Postmoderne: Rapport Sur Le Savoir* [The Postmodern Condition: Knowledge Report] (Critique ed.). MINUIT. (Russ. ed.: Lyotard, Jean-François. *Sostoyaniye postmoderna* [The Postmodern Condition]. Moscow: Aleteya; St. Petersburg: Institut sociologicheskikh issledovaniy Publ., 1998). (In Russian).
25. Céspedes, E. (2018). *Incommensurability, types of phenomena and relevant incompatibility (part I)*. *Cinta de Moebio*, 63, 323–330. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0717-554x2018000300323>
26. Lamarre, J. M. (2006). *Seule l'altérité enseigne* [Only otherness teaches]. *Le Télémaque*, 29(1), 69. <https://doi.org/10.3917/tele.029.0069>
27. Shchedrovickij, P. G. (1989). *Problemy nepreryvnogo obrazovaniya i pedagogicheskaya antropologiya* [Problems of continuing education and pedagogical anthropology]. Kharkov State University, Kharkov. (In Russian).
28. Bozhovich, L. I. (1968). *Lichnost' i ee formirovaniye v detskom vozraste: psichologicheskoe issledovanie* [Personality and its formation in childhood: a psychological study]. Prosveshchenie. (In Russian).
29. 42. (n.d.). Bloom B. S. <https://docplayer.nl/9414943-Benjamin-samuel-bloom-taxonomie.html>

30. Ancyferova, L. I. (1978). Metodologicheskie problemy psikhologii razvitiya [Methodological problems of developmental psychology]. *Princip razvitiya v psikhologii* [The principle of development in psychology]. Nauka, 3–20. (In Russian).
31. Brushlinskij, A. V. (1978). Problema razvitiya i psikhologiya myshleniya [The problem of development and the psychology of thinking]. *Princip razvitiya v psikhologii* [The principle of development in psychology]. Nauka, 38–62. (In Russian).
32. Slobodchikov, V. I., Isaev, E. I. (1995). *Osnovy psikhologicheskoy antropologii. Psikhologiya cheloveka: Vvedenie v psikhologiyu sub"ektivnosti: uchebnoe posobie dlya vuzov* [Fundamentals of psychological anthropology. Human psychology: Introduction to the psychology of subjectivity: a textbook for universities]. Shkola-Press. (In Russian).
33. Rancière, J. (2014). *Le Maître ignorant: Cinq leçons sur l'émancipation intellectuelle* [The Ignorant Schoolmaster. Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation]. FAYARD.
34. Carpay, J., van Oers, B. (1999) Didactic models and the problem of intertextuality and polyphony. Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen, and R-L. Punamäki (eds.), *Perspectives on Activity Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 298–313. (Russ. ed.: Carpay, Jacques, van Oers, Bert. Didakticheskie modeli i problema obuchayushchej diskussii [Didactic Models and the Problem of Teaching Discussion]. *Voprosy psikhologii* [Questions of psychology]. 4 (1993): 21–27). (In Russian).
35. Sirotkin, D. (n.d.). *Citaty Dallya*. [Dahl quotes]. Sirotkin. Retrieved May 13, 2022, from <https://burido.ru/863-tsitaty-dalya> (In Russian).
36. Foucault, M. (2017, July 10). *Michel Foucault: Omnes et singulatim: K kritike politicheskogo razuma* [Omnes et singulatim: Toward a Criticism of Political Reason]. Foucault. Retrieved March 1, 2020, from <https://gtmarket.ru/library/articles/7370>. (In Russian).
37. Ogurcov, A. P., Platonov, V. V. (2004). *Obrazy obrazovaniya. Zapadnaya filosofiya obrazovaniya. XX vek* [Images of education. Western philosophy of education. XX century]. Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute, St. Petersburg. (In Russian).
38. Malahova, V. G., Bokova, T.N. (2020). Filosofskie idei postmodernizma i ih vliyanie na sistemu obrazovaniya v Rossii i SSHA [Philosophical ideas of postmodernism and their impact on the education system in Russia and the USA]. *Obrazovanie i samorazvitie – Education and Self Development*, vol. 15, 1, 93–103. <https://doi.org/10.26907/esd15.1.08>. (In Russian).
39. Polonnikov, A. A. (1996). Otkrytie mira detstva (Utopiya J.-J. Rousseau) [Discovery of the World of Childhood (Utopia by J.-J. Rousseau)]. *Adukacyya i vyhavanne – Education and Upbringing*, 11, 112–118. (In Russian).
40. Burman, E. (1994). *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology (Critical Psychology)* (1st ed.). Routledge. (Russ. ed.: Burman, Erica. *Dekonstruktivnaya psikhologiya razvitiya* [Deconstructing Developmental Psychology]. Izhevsk: Udmurt University Press., ERGO, 2006). (In Russian).
41. Klus-Stańska, D. (2016). Odwrót od rozwoju: kontrowersyjna czy obiecująca zmiana paradygmatu wczesnej edukacji [A Retreat from Development: a Controversial or Promising Paradigm Shift in Early Childhood Education]. *Studia Edukacyjne – Educational Studies*. 38, 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.14746/se.2016.38.1>
42. Dylak, S. (2020). Behawioryzm i konstruktywizm wobec człowieczych czynów, wiedzy i moralności ...ku (nie) podzielanej edukacji [Behaviourism and constructivism toward human acts, knowledge and morality ...toward (not) shared education]. *Problemy Wczesnej Edukacji – Early Education Problems*, 51(4), 60–74. <https://doi.org/10.26881/pwe.2020.51.05>
43. Rousseau, J.-J. (1762). *Émile ou De l'éducation* (ed. 1re) [Emile, or On Education]. La Haye. (Russ. ed.: Rousseau, J.-J. *Emil*, ili O vospitanii [Emile, or On Education]. Rousseau, J.-J., Komensky, J. A., Locke, J., Pestalozzi, J. H. *Pedagogicheskoe nasledie* [Pedagogical legacy]. Moscow: Pedagogika, 1989, 199–296). (In Russian).
44. Vygotskij, L. S., Luriya, A. R. (1993). *Etyudy po istorii povedeniya: Obez'yana. Primitiv. Rebenok* [Etudes on the history of behavior: Monkey. Primitive. Child]. Pedagogika-Press. (In Russian)
45. Dylewski, M. (2018). Antypedagogika “nie wychowuj, tylko współdziałaj” [Anti-pedagogy “do not educate, only cooperate”]. *Biblioteka internetowa “Akademii Wychowania”* [Online library of “Akademia Wychowania”]. <http://www.misjarodzinna.pl/new/1335373897.pdf>
46. Sachkova, N.A. (2021). Teoreticheskie osnovaniya ponyatiya “inkul'turaciya”: konkretizaciya terminologicheskikh granic [Theoretical foundations of the concept of “inculturation”: specification of terminological boundaries”].

- Sovremennaya nauka: aktual'nye problemy teorii i praktiki* [Modern Science: Actual Problems of Theory and Practice], 2, 32–35. <https://doi.org/10.37882/2500-3682.2021.02.26> (In Russian).
47. Płaneta, F. (2019). Św. Augustyn a prezentyzm [St. Augustine and presentism]. *Nauki ścisłe – Science*, 18, 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.26361/ZNTDSC.10.2019.18.03>
 48. H. von Schoenebeck – *Antypedagogika. Nowy sposób wychowania dzieci?* (2014, January 26). ramonaczajka. Retrieved July 9, 2019, from <https://ramonaczajka.wordpress.com/2014/01/26/h-von-schoenebeck-antypedagogika-nowy-sposob-wychowania-dzieci/>
 49. Rogers, C. R., & Freiberg, J. H. (1994). *Freedom to Learn* (Subsequent ed.). Pearson College Div. (Russ. ed.: Rogers, Carl R., Freiberg, H. Jerome. *Svoboda uchit'sya* [Freedom to Learn]. Moscow: Smysl, 2002). (In Russian).
 50. Piaget, J. (1979). La psychogenèse des connaissances et sa signification épistémologique. Théories du langage, théories de l'apprentissage [Psychogenesis of knowledge and its epistemological significance]. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 53–64. (Russ. ed.: Piaget, Jean. Psihogeneza znanij i ego epistemologicheskoe znachenie [Psychogenesis of knowledge and its epistemological significance]. *Semiotika* [Semiotics]. Moscow: Raduga, 1983: 90–101). (In Russian).
 51. Maslow, A. H., Maslow, B. G., & Geiger, H. (1993). *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature* (1st ed.). Penguin / Arkana. (Russ. ed.: Maslow, Abraham H., Maslow, Bretha G., Geiger, Henry. *Dal'nie predely chelovecheskoj psihiki* [The Farther Reaches of the Human Psyche]. St. Petersburg: Eurasia, 1997). (In Russian).
 52. Śliwerski, B. (2019). *Pedagogika nedatywna* [Pedagogy is non-dative]. Kwieciński, Z., Śliwerski, B. *Podręcznik akademicki* [Academic textbook]. PWN, 561–570. (In Polish)
 53. Orlov, A. B. (2002). Psihologiya lichnosti i sushchnosti cheloveka: Paradigmy, proekcii, praktiki: Ucheb. posobie dlya studentov psihologicheskikh fakul'tetov [Psychology of personality and human essence: Paradigms, projections, practices. Study guide for students of psychological faculties]. Akademiya. (In Russian).
 54. Maslakov, S. V. (2015). Kritika postmodernizma kak global'nyj trend sovremennosti [Criticism of postmodernism as a global trend of modernity]. *Teoriya i praktika obshchestvennogo razvitiya – Theory and practice of social development*, 12, 380–382. (In Russian).
 55. Sokal, A., & Bricmont, J. (1997). Impostures intellectuelles. *The Modern Language Review*, 1(94), 217–221. (Russ. ed.: Sokal, Alan. Bricmont, Jean. *Intellectual'nye ulovki. Kritika filosofii postmoderna* [Intellectual tricks. Criticism of postmodern philosophy]. Moscow: Dom intellektual'noj knigi, 2002). (In Russian).
 56. Mozhejko, M. A. (2015). Ya i Drugoj: chto den' gryadushchij mne gotovit. Vozmozhno li schast'e v XXI v. [Me and the Other: what the coming day is preparing for me. Is happiness possible in the 21st century?]. *Sociologiya – Sociology*, 4, 87–96. (In Russian).
 57. Mikhulina, O. (2011). Filosofiya obrazovaniya i postmodernizm [Philosophy of education and postmodernism]. *Svitoglyad. – Filosofiya. – Religiya* [Worldview. – Philosophy. – Religion], issue 1, 58–68. (In Russian).
 58. Omel'chenko, A. V. (2011). Postmodernizm i pedagogika [Postmodernism and pedagogy]. In: Tovazhnyans'kij, L. L., Romanovs'kij, O. G. (eds.). *Problemi ta perspektivi formuvannya nacional'noi humanitarno-tekhničnoj eliti* [Problems and prospects of formation of the national humanitarian and technical elite]. Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute, Kharkiv, vol. 28(32), 215–224. (In Russian).
 59. Szkudlarek, T. (2009) *Wiedza i wolność w pedagogice amerykańskiego postmodernizmu (II Wyd.)* [Knowledge and freedom in the pedagogy of American postmodernism]. Impuls.
 60. Dolin, V. A. (2013). Koncept “smert' sub”ekta” v sovremennoj filosofii [“Death of Subject” concept in contemporary philosophy]. *Istoricheskie, filosofskie, politicheskie i yuridicheskie nauki, kul'turologiya i iskusstvovedenie. Voprosy teorii i praktiki – Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, cultural studies and art history. Questions of theory and practice*, vol. 2, 4, 56–61. (In Russian).
 61. Domańska, E. (2008). Humanistyka nie-antropocentryczna a studia nad rzeczami [Non-Anthropocentric Human Sciences and Thing Studies]. *Kultura Współczesna – Contemporary Culture*, 3, 9–21.
 62. Krizan, A.I. (2019). Ideja postcheloveka: sravnitel'nyj analiz transgumanizma i postgumanizma [The Idea of the Posthuman: A Comparative Analysis of Transhumanism and Posthumanism]. *Filosofskie nauki – Philosophical Sciences*, vol. 62, 4, 132–147. <https://doi.org/10.30727/0235-1188-2019-62-4-132-147> (In Russian).
 63. Chutoranski, M. (2017). W stronę nie-antropocentrycznej ontologii tego, co edukacyjne [Towards the non-anthropocentric ontology of the educational]. *Teraźniejszość – Człowiek – Edukacja* [Present – Man – Education], vol. 20, 4(80), 8–21.

64. Chutoranski, M. (2020). *Nie(tylko)ludzkie wymiary edukacji. W stronę pedagogiki nieantropocentrycznej* [Not (only) the human dimensions of education. Towards non-anthropocentric pedagogy]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego.
65. Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (1994). *Postmodernism and Education: Different Voices, Different Worlds (One World Archaeology; 25)* (1st ed.). Routledge.
66. Bekus-Goncharova, N. E., Korol', D. Yu. (2004). Polidiskursivnost' i obrazovatel'noe sobytie [Polydiscursivity and educational event]. In: Gusakovskij, M. A. (ed.). *Universitet kak centr kul'turoporozhdayushchego obrazovaniya. Izmenenie form kommunikacii v uchebnom processe* [University as a center of culture-generating education. Changing the forms of communication in the learning process]. Belarusian State University, Minsk, 88–89 (In Russian).
67. Palonnikov, A. A., Korol, D. Y., & Korchalova, N. D. (2018). Izmenenie diskursivnoj politiki sub'ekta v universitetskom obrazovanii [Change in the discursive policy of the subject in university education]. *Vestnik Tomskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Filosofiya, Sotsiologiya, Politologiya – Tomsk State University Journal of Philosophy, Sociology and Political Science*, 42, 166–178. <https://doi.org/10.17223/1998863x/42/18> (In Russian).
68. Klus-Stańska D., Połonnikow A. (2017). Zmiana polityki symbolicznej w pedagogicznym kształceniu uniwersyteckim: prolegomeny do programu badań nad edukacją ewentualną [The change of symbolic policy in the academic pedagogical education: introduction to the plan of research on “possible education”]. *Studia Pedagogiczne. Problemy społeczne, edukacyjne i artystyczne – Pedagogical studies. Social, educational and artistic problems*, LXX(70), 37–55 (In Polish)
69. Szkudlarek, T. (2012). Tożsamość [Identity]. In: *Dyskursywna konstrukcja podmiotu: przyczynek do rekonstrukcji pedagogiki kultury* [The discursive construction of the subject: a contribution to the reconstruction of cultural pedagogy]. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, Gdańsk, 346–419. (In Polish)
70. Groenwald, M. (2009). Nieoczekiwany wynik egzaminu – dlaczego zaskoczył? [Unexpected result of the exam – why was it surprising?]. In: Hurło, L., Klus-Stańskiej, D., Łojko, M. (eds.). *Paradygmaty współczesnej dydaktyki* [The paradigms of contemporary didactics]. Impuls, 322–331.
71. Dirkx, J. M., Mezirow, J., & Cranton, P. (2006). Musings and Reflections on the Meaning, Context, and Process of Transformative Learning. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 4(2), 123–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344606287503>
72. Drabata, A. (2018). Dekonstrukcja znaczeń nadawanych żądaniom przez nauczycieli pracujących z uczniami z niepełnosprawnością intelektualną [Deconstruction of meanings given to demands by teachers working with students with intellectual disabilities]. *Niepełnosprawność* [Disability], 30. <https://doi.org/10.4467/25439561.np.18.032.9870>
73. Wheeler, G. (2000). Beyond Individualism: Toward a New Understanding of Self, Relationship, & Experience. GICPress. (Russ. ed.: Wheeler, Gordon. *Geshtal'tterapiya postmoderna: za predelami individualizma* [Postmodern Gestalt Therapy: Beyond Individualism]. Moscow: Smysl; CheRo, 2005). (In Russian).
74. Łażewska, D. (2015). Derridiańska dekonstrukcja jako strategia odrzucania wartości prawdy w pedagogice [Derridian deconstruction as a strategy of rejecting the value of truth in pedagogy]. In: Furmanek, W., Długosz, A. (eds.). *Wartości w pedagogice. Urzeczywistnianie wartości* [Values in pedagogy. Realizing values]. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, Rzeszów, 165–172.
75. Melosik, Z. T., Szkudlarek, T. (2009). *Kultura, tożsamości edukacja: migotanie znaczeń* [Culture, identity, education: flickering of significations]. Impuls.
76. Jameson, F. (n.d.). *Reprezentacja globalizacji* [Representation of globalization]. <https://Polit.Ru/>. Retrieved April 17, 2022, from <https://polit.ru/article/2010/04/05/jameson/> (In Russian).
77. Padilla-Petry, P., Hernández-Hernández, F., & Sánchez-Valero, J. A. (2021). Using Cartographies to Map Time and Space in Teacher Learning in and Outside School. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20, 160940692199290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406921992906>
78. Galperin, P. Ya. (2006). Metody obucheniya i umstvennogo razvitiya rebenka [Methods of teaching and mental development of the child]. In: *Pedagogicheskaya psichologiya: hrestomatiya* [Pedagogical psychology: a reader]. Piter, 39–44. (In Russian).
79. Dubrovina, I. V., Kruglov, V. S. (1988). Psihologo-pedagogicheskie predposylki povysheniya effektivnosti obucheniya shkol'nikov 12–17 let [Psychological and pedagogical prerequisites for improving the effectiveness of learning of schoolchildren 12–17 years old].

of teaching schoolchildren aged 12–17 years]. In: Dubrovina, I. V., Kruglova, B. S. (ed.). *Osobennosti obucheniya i psichicheskogo razvitiya shkol'nikov 13–17 let* [Features of teaching and mental development of schoolchildren aged 13–17 years]. Moscow: Pedagogy, 293–303. (In Russian).

80. Szkudlarek, T. (2009). *Media. Szkic z filozofii i pedagogiki dystansu* [Media. Sketch on the philosophy and pedagogy of distance]. Impuls.
81. Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2004). *Discourse Analysis and the Study of Classroom Language and Literacy Events: A Microethnographic Perspective* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Alexander A. Polonnikov, Belarusian State Pedagogical University named after Maxim Tank,
Sovetskaya Street, 18, Minsk, Republic of Belarus, 220050.
alexpolonnikov@gmail.com

Natalya D. Korchalova, Belarusian State Pedagogical University named after Maxim Tank,
Sovetskaya Street, 18, Minsk, Republic of Belarus, 220050.
korchalova.n@gmail.com

Submitted May 25, 2022