THE CRISIS OF UPBRINGING IN THE CONTEMPORARY CHRONOTOPE: POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

M. N. Dudina[1] and V. I. Dolgova[2]

The authors attempted to unravel the origins of crisis of upbringing in Russia in the radically changed chronotope of the end of the 20th – the beginning of the 21st century. The concept of upbringing possesses unique implications for the Russian people, and understanding its true essence might help estimate its dynamics in the historical perspective. Social and cultural transformations that the country (together with the entire world) is now facing require drastic changes in education and upbringing.

Keywords: chronotope, social and cultural transformations, upbringing, the phenomenon of a 'well-educated, but not well-brought-up' person.

Let us now specify the core term of this article and its role in Russian pedagogy together with two other notions connected with it: *upbringing, learning, and education*. There is no exact definition for all of them, but they are strictly separated in the field of meaning, though in everyday life they might be mixed up and considered to be equal. It should be stressed that in English there is no exact equivalent for the Russian concept of '*vospitanie*' (Bronfenbrenner 1976) because of the special implications the Russian people attach to it; however, in this article we decided to use the English word 'upbringing'. Let us now dwell upon those implications to make it clear. There are common vectors of meanings found among the researchers of this notion: *in the broad social sense* it denotes wholesome influence of society upon a growing individual; *in the broad pedagogical sense* it implies a purposeful activity of professionals in terms of educational process; *in the narrow pedagogical sense* it means specific activity aimed at building particular skills and features of character of learners (Ilyina, Kolesnikova, Semenov, Schurkova, etc.). It should be also mentioned that in the pre-revolutionary and Soviet Russian tradition *vospitanie* was a priority. But when in 1992 the Act on Education of the Russian Federation was put into action, the notion 'education' got a broader interpretation (despite many amendments later). In the Preamble of the Act it is stated: "In the present Act education shall be considered a purposeful process of upbringing and learning in the interests of a man, society, and state; it shall therefore imply achieving by a citizen (a learner) educational levels set by the government". Thus in the nearest future pedagogical science will have to choose priorities. In this article, however, we will follow the Russian tradition. According

[1] Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin, Lenin Avenue, 51, 620137 Ekaterinburg, Russia

[2] South Ural State Humanitarian Pedagogical University, Russia, 454080, Chelyabinsk, Lenin Avenue, 69

to V. Dal, 'education' is a process of making up something into a wholesome unit, spiritual improvement, enlightenment [2]. He brings up the following proverbs and sayings to illustrate this idea *(translated from Russian close to original meaning)*: "Science develops brains and intellectual capacities, but not always heart and character", "Learning process develops the brain, upbringing improves the spirit", "It is much easier to educate one's brain than one's heart", "It doesn't necessarily mean that a well-educated person is also well-bred" (Dal 1978: [5]).

Thus we have come across the phenomenon of an *educated, but not well-brought-up* person which is clearly closely connected with the ontological existence of the crisis of upbringing: having mastered various skills and technologies, educated, but immoral and spiritually lacking people may consciously or unconsciously use those skills against nature, community and themselves. In spite of organic bonds between them, learning, education and upbringing do differ in the aspect of their nature and meaning; however, they all could be regarded either as means of potential support given to an individual to ensure his or her self-development or as tools for building ideals and set patterns prescribed externally. It is not difficult to see that the latter one looks exactly like a definition from a textbook which viewed learning, education and upbringing as something that would last for centuries. There all learners were considered to be objects, passive recipients of knowledge and norms. This strategy, however, shows the background of crisis of upbringing scientifically proven by E. Durkheim's sociology of education and later developed by M. Weber and T. Parsons. We can agree with them that successful development of any society and state is directly and indirectly affected by their educational system which is used as a political tool. Having named the object of sociology 'social reality', Durkheim supposed that pedagogical ideal while created by society directed the process of upbringing according to its social organization. Therefore upbringing can be considered a social phenomenon in its very core, but, as Durkheim added with a tingle of regret, "this fundamental truth is rarely accepted". Among those who did not accept this statement Durkheim mentioned Kant, Mille, Herbart, and Spenser who believed that "upbringing is for the most part an individual thing; hence, pedagogy is nothing more than a direct corollary of psychology" (Durkheim 1932).

In this case upbringing doesn't have a goal connected with people and their interests, as "it is mainly a tool with the help of which society continually reproduces the conditions of its existence". In every new generation society is facing "almost a complete *tabula rasa*. It has to add to every newly born selfish and antisocial creature another one, who will be capable of leading social and moral life" (Durkheim 1932). For ages manipulative techniques have been efficiently applied to authoritative, assimilative pedagogy despite the differences in chronotopes (for instance, Spartan, Jesuit, SS and Soviet pedagogy, or the upbringing of samurai). This pedagogical phenomenon can be explained by the fact that fundamental

principles of upbringing's conformity to nature and culture might be alone or together indifferent to personal freedom of a growing man, if the goal is the suppression of this freedom. That's why the theory and practice of pedagogy has a notion of 'building' which is absent in philosophical, psychological and pedagogical discourses of humanistic character since it contradicts the idea of freedom, rights and personal dignity of children and adults.

Let us now try to answer the following questions: how and why did it happen that humanity with all the rapid achievements in science, technology, and manufacture, especially in the 20th century, did not think much about the consequences of this progress for the person's body, soul, spirit, and for society in general? Why couldn't long-standing pedagogical traditions of the West (Christian ones) and of the East (Islamic ones) prevent the increase of Evil and couldn't enhance the positions of Good? Are there any potential ways out of the global crisis connected with education (the learning process and upbringing) of young generations? Is there a slight possibility of creating a *society of communicative rationality* (Habermas, 1982) in multicultural, multiconfessional, polyparadigmal, polyethnic global space? The history of mankind contains many vivid examples of rational discourse that prevented military, political, economic, financial catastrophes. We cannot help mentioning that even in global pedagogy it was a dialogue of paradigms (religious and mundane, conservative and liberal), not their opposition, that proved to be constructive [16, 18]. Why then is this crisis of upbringing we are now facing is so overwhelming and long-term? The experience of pedagogical reflection directed primarily at the present and the future, not at the past, convinces us that this age-old tradition of inhumane attitude to children is not effective, and it was cast off by the Declaration of Children Rights in 1959 which conformed freedom, rights and dignity of children (It should be however noted that in the researches conducted by us among the students, their parents and teachers this event wasn't marked as significant) [5, 24]. Mankind has made a long challenging journey abandoning, neglecting, then retrieving and resurrecting humanism. Fortunately, today education is available for youngsters, and they might learn life-long if they only wish to. So the formula 'education for living' has turned into another one, more promising and meaningful for every man and society in general, – 'life-long education'. A person of any social status, gender, age, and entire community require education because it provides us with social elevators, and it represents an important administrative and social resource, a means of satisfying individual needs and rights declared by the Constitution. In the course of dramatic historical transformations of the 1990s in Russia connected with the country's democratization and humanization of life the critical state of education (despite all the reforms and attempts at modernization) finally drew the attention of scholars. It became crucial due to the new conditions which required particular personal skills to see and solve problems and tasks no longer limited by given

trajectories of thinking. The origin of this crisis was found in pedagogical genesis that neglected the obvious significance of childhood as it was. For a long time children's personalities and identities were suppressed, and they were psychologically and pedagogically violated being deprived of their rights and freedoms. To prove this thesis let us turn to Lloyd deMause, a psychologist of the 20th century, who defined six major childrearing modes which encompass historical space-time and are still applicable today (the difference is in the range of popularity). They are: *the infanticidal mode* (Antiquity – 4th century AD) which affected the survived greatly; *the abandoning mode* (4th century AD – 13th century AD) where the children were wet-nursed outside and sent to monasteries and nunneries, or served as apprentices away from home; *the ambivalent mode* (14th – 17th centuries) which combined parental extreme love and hate for their children, and the major task was to 'mold' children into the desirable shape. The guidelines for better upbringing first appeared in the 14th century, and it was also the time when the cult of Maria and Jesus (the representation of 'caring Mother') started to spread. The 17th century brought up another childrearing mode – *the intrusive one*: parents tried to get closer to their children and gain control over their minds and intrinsic states, their needs and desires; systematic beating ceased. *The socializing mode* (19th – the middle of the 20th century) required the use of 'mental discipline' and accepting parents' goals. From the middle of the 20th century there exists *the helping mode*: both parents take part in their children's lives, understand and satisfy their growing needs, create necessary conditions to develop their interests and calmly accept the periods of regress in their development. L. deMause remarks that children raised in this particular mode "finally become kind sincere people not prone to depressions, with strong will, that never follow the crowd and can withstand authority" (deMause 1982: [6, p. 83-86]).

This research represents social, psychological, pedagogical reflection and may serve as a catharsis that is vital for evoking optimism [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 20, 21]. The author claims that "many parents seem to be stuck at an earlier stage…even today there are people who beat, kill and rape children". Still this classification helps trace a gradual merging of a parent and a child, for parents are slowly overcoming their fears and anxieties, and begin to develop a capacity of recognizing and satisfying their children's needs. In the current chronotope children's rights, freedom and dignity have become a legalized norm as a result of evolution – "from mores to rights" (Kislov 2002 [14]). This is what anthropology claims: a person is set free, he/she is an 'unfinished project', whose primary duty is to 'complete' himself/herself; therefore, the task of teachers and parents is to assist him with that, to support his identity's development during all stages of his growing up [3, 14, 26]. Here we come to the core pedagogical problem: the significance of *goal and means,* which is solved differently depending on understanding the child's nature and the purpose of upbringing. Since opinions may be not only different,

but even opposite (the child is the goal, the child is the means), *conformity to nature and culture* doesn't necessarily guarantee humane attitude to the child. In any chronotope none of these two principles taken together or apart guarantees freedom, or provides the ethization of upbringing, or brings closer the humanistic ideal, or leads to further democratization of society. Then pedagogy and education make social and cultural programming, that's why they are responsible for an individual and society in general. And only the third fundamental principle – *conformity to freedom* – together with the others justifies the significance of childhood as it is.

Historical and genetic analysis has led us to a conclusion that previous generations have been raised in a relatively stable system of values which is now being rapidly reconsidered in the current chronotope. Children and adults are now living in the world that offers immense opportunities for physical, psychological, social, spiritual, and moral development. At the same time we have to deal with the increasing rate of early degradation: the factors of a growing disagreement between a person, nature and society are changing quickly (underage drinking, drug and other types of addiction, sexualization, and uncontrolled medical consumption, all of which instigate unhealthy style of life and provoke verbal and nonverbal aggression) [13, 15].

Let us now enlist the basic transformations which affect the crisis of upbringing (some of them will be presented more thoroughly). Anthropogenic and sociogenic catastrophes stimulate the imperative of survival. The nature and consequences of technological progress have been perceived in a positive way as an ode to a Man who managed to tame nature; that has been deeply reflected in school and university curriculum. But then the period of exhilaration ended, and the anxiety caused by natural disasters, social risks and dangerous consequences for an individual and the world in general ensued . It was then discovered that all flesh was prone to the risk of self-destruction. "Will the humanity survive or not?" (Moiseyev 1999 [17]) – that is the question of sustainable development closely connected with the future being projected today. Pedagogy and education make a great contribution to the future, and with their results it is possible to foresee new qualities of life and personal skills as the most vital resource of development.

Real freedom and democratization of society that take into account personal interests of learners are a historical novelty for Russian upbringing and educational system.

In this context we have also witnessed the return of religiousness and ecclesiasticism (notions that are still being equivalent in everyday life) and attempts at spiritual upbringing based on this background. In the current chronotope social and cultural memory has led us back to Orthodox Christianity, our former official religion and a means of nation-building, and to Islam and Judaism as ways of

living, thinking and behaving for children and adults, providing them with a system of moral values.

Let us now take a closer look at how the country of 'ardent atheism' has returned to religiousness. Perestroika brought up many changes: for instance, there appeared a lot of Orthodox, Muslim and Jewish schools, mundane educational institutions included the subject of religious upbringing to the curriculum, priests could enter universities and army, schools and universities were sanctified, ships were sprinkled with holy water before the first voyage, new army recruits were blessed by a priest. On the one hand, it demonstrates an attributive social need for moral support which is somehow lacking. On the other hand, there have been raised questions about understanding the very idea of religiousness and ecclesiasticism, the meaning of rituals, faith and lore, and, finally, about the competence of those who enlighten people about all these issues. Looking for answers it is impossible to ignore the fact that during a thousand years' time moral and spiritual atmosphere of the Russian society and education were connected with the Russian Orthodox Church. And 'suddenly' the Soviet government destroyed this age-old tradition and converted believers into atheists. It is clear that communistic ideology itself couldn't destruct churches so ardently and fervently, burn sacred books, sell icons and other Orthodox attributes. Those awful things were committed by people who had graduated from seminaries, gymnasiums, universities, who had studied the Scripture, confessed and prayed. N. Berdyaev [2] mentioned this special type of 'Orthodox without Christianity' meaning a formal practice mixed up with paganism and mysticism. S. Kierkegaard, being a Christian philosopher, called this 'playing Christianity'.

One more group of social and cultural transformations of considerable importance is linked with the crisis of family devoted to the devaluation of marriage and family unit and dissemination of open, experimental and homosexual marriages. Family has been a stable social institution for ages, but now it has to deal with difficult challenges and problems of upbringing. Already in the beginning of the 21st century the state of family was defined as 'critical' [22].

In this situation some children – thus outrunning their parents – appropriated certain previously parental functions: they helped their mothers and fathers master new gadgets and devices and even promoted values to them (e.g., they took them to church, to a psychologist or a narcologist, etc.). It actually proves that in the current chronotope there is a necessary background for youngsters to develop and acquire true values which will lead them to a healthy style of life and constructive behavior. This sounds really promising especially taking into account the increasing interest in the problems of family in social sphere and upbringing; for instance, not so long ago in our region there was developed a program called 'Ural Family' which is devoted to demographic development of Sverdlovsk region (Tsennost' semyi – problema vospitaniya [Family value as a problem of upbringing] 2008).

Here we cannot avoid the aspect of *infantilization of younger generations* especially in contrast with the previous ones. Probably the times when a yesterday's child, now barely a teen would say something like "There are only two men in the family – my Dad and me" have passed and will never ever come back.

One may recall how two 14 year old teenagers vowed to sacrifice their lives for *the Homeland* standing on Sparrow Hills "before all Moscow", and now not many schoolboys could recognize among these brave youths Herzen and Ogarev.

Current chronotope has many ways of inflicting physical, mental and social damage upon a child which is not always perceived as destructive. For example, let's discuss the so-called *intensive 'disneyzation' of youngsters' subculture* promoted by mass media [4, 19]. On the one hand, personal development is positively stimulated by information and communication channels that provide opportunities for cognition and self-improvement thanks to interactive methods of games, competitions, creative activities. On the other hand, negative influence of mass media on IQ, feelings, speech and relationships is often prevailing. Information channels of different kind directly and spontaneously construct childhood via media culture, toys, books, language, clothes, jewelry, hair styles, makeup (Boyko 2009 [3]). In this way children today acquire the values of childhood. Sexual aspect cannot be neglected as well since it assaults the subconscious of boys and girls [1, 23, 25].

In this way, the subculture of childhood, adolescence and youth enhances social infantilism. Being the part of basic culture, it is therefore connected with a particular gender and age. With growing freedoms the problems of upbringing (gender upbringing included) are becoming more prominent. The ability of being free means being responsible, and this is true for all aspects of upbringing, among which the problem of *gender identity* is significant. The distinction between social and biological representations of gender was caused by intensive social and cultural transformations which required the analysis of new data and pedagogical modeling of effective gender upbringing. Gender identification unsurprisingly requires a competent social, cultural, pedagogical and psychological support.

References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1975). Voprosy literatury i jestetiki [The issues of literature and aesthetics]. Moscow, Respublika Publ. House.

Berdyaev, N.I. (1995). O rabstve i svobode. Opyt personalisticheskoj filosofii [On slavery and freedom. The experience of personalized philosophy]. Moscow, Respublika Publ. House.

Bojko, M.A. (2009). «W.I.T.C.H» kak fenomen disneizacii subkul'tury detst-va [«W.I.T.C.H» as a phenomenon of disneyzation of childhood subculture] / Filosofskoe mirovozzrenie i kartina mira. Chetvertye Lojfmanovskie chtenija: materialy Vseros. nauch. Konf. Ekaterinburg, 17-18 dekabrja 2009. – Ekaterinburg, p. 12-14.

Belkin, A.S. (2013). Chto takoe horosho i chto takoe ploho [What is good and what is bad] // Argumenty i fakty 1-2, 15.

Dal, V. I. (1978). Tolkovyj slovar' zhivogo russkogo jazyka [A dictionary of real Russian language] Russkij jazyk, Moscow.

DeMause, L. (1982). Foundations of Psychohistory. New York: Creative Roots.

Dolgova V.I. Aspects of emotional stability in volunteers of gerontology programs. Advances in Gerontology. 2014. T. 4. № 4. P. 278-282.

Dolgova V.I. Impact of the arch suburb on the state of health, activity and mood of a person. Biosciences Biotechnology Research Asia. 2014. T. 11. P. 307-311.

Dudina, M.N. (1998). Pedagogika: dolgij put' k gumanisticheskoj jetike [Pedagogy: a long way to humanistic ethics]. – Ekaterinburg: «Nauka», Ural'skoe otdelenie.

Dudina, M.N. (2008). Istorija pedagogiki: dialog paradigm [The history of pedagogy: the dialogue of paradigms]. – Ekaterinburg: Izd-vo Ural.un-ta.

Dudina, M.N. (2009). Razvitie gumanisticheskoj pedagogiki v problemnom prostranstve jekzistencializma [The development of humanistic pedagogy in the problematic field of existentialism] / Izvestija Ural'skogo gosudarstvennogo uni-versiteta. Serija 1. Problemy obrazovanija, nauki i kul'tury 1/2(62), 21-30.

Durkheim, E. (1932). Education and Sociology. New York : Free Press. – Đ. 79-83.

Kislov, G.A. (2002). Opravdanie detstva: ot nravov k pravu [Justification of childhood: from morals to rights]. Ekaterinburg.

Kuleshova, E.V. (2012). Nravstvennaja kategorija «dolg» v predstavlenijah sovremennyh studentov [Moral category of duty in the minds of university students] // Vospitanie v sovremennom kul'turno-obrazovatel'nom prostranstve. M., - Samara, p. 242-249.

Merenkov, A.V. (2012). Problemy jeffektivnosti nakazanij [The problems of punishments and their efficiency] / Kul'tura, lichnost', obshhestvo v sovremennom mire: Metodologija, opyt jempiricheskogo issledovanija. HV Mezhdunarodnaja konferencija pamjati prof. L.N. Kogana, 22-23 marta 2012, Ekaterinburg.

Moiseyev, N.N. (1999). Byt' ili ne byt'…chelovechestvu? [Will the humanity survive or not?], Moscow.

Nazarov, I.V., Korneeva, T.S. (2001). Specifika rossijskoj civilizacii i ee ot-razhenie v mentalitete [The specifics of Russian civilization and its reflection in mentality] / Kul'tura i civilizacija/ /Materialy Vserossijskoj nauchnoj konferencii. – Ekaterinburg, p. 51-55.

RIA Novosti, (2012). [Digital Resource]. Available at: http://ria.ru/education/20110406/ 361614150.html#ixzz2JdU3gKSD1998 g.

Rogers, C. (1994). Vzgljad na psihoterapiju: Stanovlenie cheloveka [Psychotherapy: the development of a man]. M. Progress; Univers.

Feldshtein, D.I. (2012). Doklad na obshhem sobranii RAO "Problemy psiholo-go-pedagogicheskih nauk v prostranstvenno-vremennoj situacii XXI veka". [Digital Resource]. Available at: http://raop.ru/index.php.

Tsennost' sem'i – problema vospitanija [Family value as a problem of upbringing] (2008) / Materialy nauchno-prakticheskoj konferencii «Programma demograficheskogo razvitija Sverdlovskoj oblasti na period do 2025 goda («Ural'skaja sem'ja») – glavnyj faktor investicij v cheloveka». Sb. dokladov. - Ekaterinburg: Pravitel'stvo Sverdlovskoj ob-lasti. Ministerstvo jekonomiki i truda Sverdlovskoj oblasti. – Ekaterinburg.

Habermas, J. (1981). Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns: Bd. II. Zur Kritik der funktionalistischen Vernunft. – Frankfurt. – 641 s.

Erikson, E. (1996). Identichnost': junost' i krizis [Identity: youth and crisis]. Izdatel'skaja gruppa «Pro-gress». Moscow.

Jaspers, K. (1994). Smysl i naznachenie istorii [The meaning of history]. Moscow, Respublika Publ. House.

Disney. Igry dlja devochek. W.I.T.C.H. Charodejki [Games for girls. W.I.T.C.H.] [Digital Resource]. Available at: http:// wwwnd.ru /catalog /products /witch.