DOI 10.26886/2520-7474.1(45)2021.12

UDC: 378.091.2:78

**AXIOLOGICAL AND ACMEOLOGICAL ASPECTS IN
DEMOCRATIZATION OF EDUCATION**

I. M. Syladiy, Candidate of Sciences in Education, Associate Professor

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4954-4554>

e-mail: siladiy@kmf.uz.ua

Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education,
Transcarpathian Region, Ukraine

The article has established that justice and solidarity, as two social values and principles of social organization, can be recreated in the educational process on all levels of continuous education. It has been clarified that in conditions of a global environmental crisis leaving little time for mankind to solve the problem of survival, environmental safety appears as a top-priority value of the highest order. Differences of democratic values have been identified. The article reveals universal democratic values, particularly human rights, tolerance, solidarity and environmental safety, along with peacefulness and merely moral values of mercy, conscience and responsibility which form the basis for the Pedagogical Constitution of Europe. Our analysis indicates that modernization of the education system in Ukraine at its present-day stage is directed towards development of fundamental science, Ukrainian and global cultural values. It has been established that the human-centred direction of education appears as the essential characteristics of the process of its democratization.

Key words: democratization of education, globalization, fundamental-philosophical view, anthropocentrism, education values.

General definition of the problem. In the wide range of relevant problems in philosophical interpretation of world development, special attention should be paid to the problem of development of education which provides the means to prepare a person to independent life. Education and upbringing were always in the epicentre of social relations, phenomena and processes. Even in the ancient world, they were discussed actively which is evidenced by treatises of Plato and Aristotle. In the medieval period, these problems became even more important. Although all education and culture was heavily influenced by theology at that time, education was still seen as the most effective way to prepare a person for further life. Over time, the development of mankind brought education – together with science and culture – to the role of determining factors of progress, and it was no coincidence. The society moves forward with the efforts of every generation, passing on knowledge, competencies, values, and the accumulated experience, bringing up the new generation with the ability to engage in independent creative activity. The most effective way of doing it is by means of education. Certainly, a person may enter the life space by independently learning culture and accumulating knowledge and experience through self-education and self-preparation. However, education makes this process considerably more efficient. After all, the said existences are delivered to the education applicant through reflection – consideration, generalization, interpretation – and with assessment from the viewpoint of theory and practice.

According to the definition suggested by P. Drucker, the modern world is the world of education, and the society is the “knowledge society.” The present-day information revolution strengthens this point, because a person is doomed to live a miserable life without knowledge and having necessary skills of how to use it. It is only knowledge, competencies and values developed by education that give a person confidence and support, ensure

independence and awareness of choice, and set the decisive sequence of actions that lead to success. So it is quite natural that the problem of education is a key issue for the present-day development of people, creativity and progress.

Exploration of the processes behind development of education is the topic for many research works, public discussions, parliamentary speeches in the developed countries of the world, and these activities resulted in a set of problems and contradictions that need to be defined and solved. One of the most relevant items is the problem (and task) of democratization of education, i.e. bringing the system of education in line with the needs and interests of society, and organizing this system in the context of the strategy for sustainable development. Quite literally, analysing this problem is the task that mankind cannot skip in its progress.

Many research works attempt to consider democratization of education. Unfortunately, many of them fail to explore the topic entirely. However, there is a visible emphasis on its relevance and the need for further exploration.

A considerable scientific interest for research can be found in the works on the philosophy of continuous education (V. Andrushchenko, V. Bekh, V. Kremin, V. Lutai, P. Saukh); continuous education and advanced vocational training (V. Bondar, L. Danylenko, H. Yelnikova, A. Kuzminskyi, L. Lukianova, V. Maslov, N. Nychkalo, V. Oliynyk, N. Protasova, L. Pukhovska, V. Putsov, L. Sigaieva, T. Sushchenko, T. Shamova); education for sustainable development (V. Bogoliubov, O. Pometun, N. Ridei, N. Semeniuk, O. Shevchenko); peculiarities of modern sciences: educology, educationology and education measurement (N. Kuzmenko, V. Luhovyi, V. Ogneviuk, K. Pakhotin, O. Prokaza, S. Sysoieva, A. Furman) [1].

With consideration of the relevance posed by the abovementioned problems and the urgent need to solve them, the author has chosen this topic as the subject for independent theoretical analysis.

Presentation of the core material. Education having an anthropocentric nature is the essential characteristics of the process for its democratization because it is directed to create the most optimal conditions to completely unlock abilities of every person and opportunities to realize all of their intellectual, creative and cultural potential, facilitate achievement of utmost freedom, along with the willingness to undertake responsibility for themselves, their family, local community, country and the planet in general.

In the national scientific thinking, the philosophy of anthropocentrism is conceptualized in the works by academician V. Kremen who emphasizes that “anthropocentrism is a new quality of philosophical understanding of a human being, which exceeds the scope of both the Renaissance anthropocentrism and humanism, and the philosophic anthropology, because it goes beyond them all”[2], as the modern post-industrial age is the era of a creative personality who does not fit into the established standards of thinking developed at previous stages of human history. In the scientist’s opinion, anthropocentrism seen as a new worldview philosophy focuses attention on the study of man in all of its essential manifestations, expression of the inner in-depth foundations of its existence, personality-based values, means and opportunities for their realization [2]. “The subject of anthropocentrism philosophy as noted by V. Kremen is the life of an individual seen as an entirety of the material and the ideal, the conscious and the unconscious, the finite and the infinite, the general and the national, the formal and the energetic phenomena” [2]. Thanks to the works of the academician and his followers, “anthropocentrism” is seen today as a “humanistically oriented approach to formation of a new human – an active, energetic personality, whose mind and soul live in harmony” [3], a human

who is able to live a full life in the framework of democracy and recreate the democratic way of living.

V. Andrushchenko views sociological requests as demands to build education on the basis of the anthropocentrism principle, and sees them literally as the shift of accents and placement of the human into the centre of the educational process, thus establishing the education applicant as the main subject and main goal of this process. Education should teach and educate a human with all of their humane qualities, life goals, reflections and doubts. For this purpose, we need to cognize the nature and understand the essence of man and of human existence in history, the present time, and the future [4].

The anthropocentrism of education is primarily expressed through the teacher's attitude to the child as the highest value. Every person should feel it from the very first day of staying at an educational institution. This attitude to pupils should remain until the last day of their attendance. Effectiveness and true results of anthropocentrism are primarily ensured by immediate communication between teachers and pupils. It is evident, for communication is a form of interaction in learning, and a form of cooperation between the teacher and the student, the educator and the pupil. This being said, every participant should take an active part in such communication, because one-sided communication is usually least effective. When teacher is the only active party in communication, it is perceived as moralizing and therefore it often causes dissatisfaction in pupils. S. Honcharenko emphasizes that the anthropocentric direction of education envisages a transition from the totalitarian to the humanistic paradigm of upbringing. In practice, it means achieving the atmosphere of mutual understanding, trust and insistence on high standards on the part of both the educator and the education applicants, the air of freedom, creativity and democracy that enables pupils and students to learn the laws

of citizenship and democracy while still at school [5]. The principle of conformity to nature was formulated by J. Comenius and was further developed in the works of A. Diesterweg and J. Pestalozzi. As noted by V. Kovalchuk, today this principle is developing primarily in the context of anthropocentrism as an organizational principle of personality-oriented teaching and democratization of education [6].

Today the principle of conformity to nature reinforced by the philosophy of anthropocentrism is implemented in inclusive education. In this context, UNESCO defines it as “the process of appeal for, and response to various needs of pupils through ensuring their participation in studies, cultural events and life of community, and reducing exclusion in education and the learning process” [7]. The goal of inclusive education – which can actually be implemented in democratic conditions only – is to improve the educational environment where all participants are open to diversity, where education applicants are guaranteed the satisfaction of their needs and respect for their abilities and opportunities to succeed. In practice, though, inclusive education is implemented in such a way that, with presumably similar treatment of every pupil, particular attention is paid to children with special needs. This being said, the conformity to nature of anthropocentrism (child-centrism) should take into account not only the natural peculiarities of a child, but also an attempt to go “beyond the limits,” that is, ensure correction of certain defects, medical treatment, and inclusion of such child into the full-valued life and education process as a full individual.

According to V. Kremen, it is the development of every person on the basis of their natural abilities in the time of transition to informational technologies and further on to the knowledge society, where success in production and living is seen as the main lever for further progress of mankind and development of a democratic way of life; he remarks that

values of the new era (the progress of society) are defined as continuous renewal “which is implemented with the help of an ability of human intellect to comprehend reality, transform activity and add an element of novelty.” Therefore, the goal of education efforts should be a person characterized by a “conscious focus on acquisition of something new – knowledge, experience, economic, political and cultural achievements, as well as a specific disposition to innovation”[2]. A. Toffler believes that a high-tech information society does not need millions of semiliterate people who agree to do monotonous work and humbly obey orders of their management. On the contrary, the modern society needs people capable of critical thinking, find their way in the new conditions of life, and establish new connections in the quickly changing world [8].

As remarked by Ye. Riabenko, the use of provisions of the anthropocentrism philosophy in conditions of democratization of the society in general, and democratisation of education in particular, is focused on formation of a free and responsible personality; establishment of democratic worldview mind-sets, opinions, values; ensuring conditions for free self-determination of every person to enable them to shape their own values in the form of life goals, leading motives and interests, aspirations and needs, principles etc [9].

Implementation of the anthropocentrism principle in the educational space is a social and philosophical precondition of strengthening the process of democratization of education, just as the humanitarian dimension of education opens the way for true democratism of the educational process. That is why the issue of humanization and humanitarization of education in the context of its democratization deserves special attention.

First of all, it is worth noting that the essence of the term “humanism” is interpreted as “something humane and inherent to a truly educated

person,” humanity as “humaneness, kindness, benevolence, mercy, neighbourly charity” (V. Dal) [10], and humanization, in the opinion of M. Romanenko, as “recognition of a human as a personality, of its right to freedom, realization of its abilities, and establishment of its welfare as the leading criteria of social relations” [11]. Hence humanism denotes the aspiration to humaneness, and bringing humanistic foundations to social relations. S. Sylkina notes that modern humanism is often related to freethinking, various forms of non-theistic beliefs, critical thinking, democratic ideals and universal human values[12].

In the industrial society, the way for interaction of man with nature was mostly based on mechanistic principles inherent to technology and therefore it determined the thinking and activities of its representatives. Humanitarization opposes technocracism which is deeply rooted in the present-day educational space. Humanization of education should squeeze out the “heartless” technocracism, as it opposes totalitarian and authoritarian ways of conducting the pedagogical process [13], notes A. Sakun. In his turn, R. Yevsovyh remarks that humanitarization of education is the means for global humanization of society which is required to overcome negative tendencies in the development of an industrial civilization [14].

The term “humanization” is interpreted differently in its psychological-pedagogical aspect. Some authors understand “humanization” as the need for humanitarization of the contents of education. As noted by V. Vozniak, usually humanitarization is understood as simply increasing the weight of humanitarian subjects as they play an important role in a person’s self-determination. In theory, humanitarization should oppose the scientification of education. However, if the changes are limited to mere redistribution of class hours in favour of certain subjects, there is no actual change at all. The pedagogical process itself has to be made more humanistic, as

knowledge acquired in the form which is not inherent to the student's ideas, expressed and studied in a formal way is never going to be used in practice [15]. That is why O. Honchar believes that humanitarization of education appears as upgrading the status of humanities, which envisages both increasing their weight and changes in the quality of their teaching, freeing them from primitive schematism, as well as in humanization, differentiation and customization of the teaching materials [16]. It enables education applicants to acquire not only a certain amount of knowledge in a certain field, but also the universal human culture that serves as the basis for personal development. After all, as T. Sushchenko notes, "establishment of humanism for a person and in a person is only possible through culture" [17].

Particular attention is paid to humanitarization of non-humanitarian education, engineering and technical training. T. Shargun notes that the result of humanitarization of engineering and technical training should be the future specialists' acquisition of basics of humanitarian and socio-economic sciences and mastering the culture of thinking; a high level of professional ethics and ability to reassess and analyse one's own professional opportunities; understanding the social role of their future professional activity, legal and environmental awareness; ability for self-organization and management of a work team on the dialogic basis; the skill of learning new knowledge and passing it to others etc [18]. Because, as pointed out by N. Tsymbaliuk, humanitarization of education is meant to ensure preparation of people to effective living in conditions of changes and uncertainty, to facilitate formation of skills to identify problems and solve them in a rational way, and to stimulate the needs of productive and creative nature [19].

Other scientists are not inclined to equalize the processes of humanization and humanitarization of education. For example, R.

Yevsovyh treats humanization in a broader way – it is a “theoretical and practical orientation of the entire system of education on ensuring successful growing-up and socialization of every person, its mental, psychological and physical development, forming abilities for eco-friendly activity and active participation in the level of their society, country and so on” [20]. According to this approach, humanization of education envisages bringing to life the basic guidelines, the observance of which helps education applicants to realize that for the society, a person is not a means but the goal in itself. As noted by S. Brezhneva, since early childhood a person feels an interest for the outside world, other people and themselves, and it promotes the person’s formation as a personality [21]. According to O. Honchar, in this context humanization acts as a key element of the new pedagogical thinking that focuses attention on the person and the person’s understanding of their own activity[16].

Some researchers interpret humanization of education as democratization of the nature of interaction between participants of the education process, where the teacher and the student enjoy equal rights by the extent of their knowledge and opportunities, and are active and parity partners. In the opinion of A. Verbytskyi, “humanistic conditions of learning, democratic relations between teachers and students, a creative environment of person-to-person interaction build one type of personality, while an authoritarian-bureaucratic technology of transmitting information creates an essentially different personality”. This way of organizing a “pedagogical interaction” between participants of the educational process, where a student cannot be passive but is engaged into collective and complementary cooperation between equal participants of the process, helps to represent the in-depth essence of humanizing education.

As two mutually dependent processes, humanization and humanitarization of education launch realization of a principally new

direction in education, which is connected with producing a harmoniously developed and professionally competent personality rather than an impersonalized future specialist. The humanistic direction of education changes the traditional idea of one of its goals – that of forming a system of knowledge and skills. These days, the humanistic goal of education requires urgent review of its contents that has to include not only latest scientific and technical information, but also humanitarian knowledge and skills that develop a student's personality, an education applicant's ability to engage in creative activity, the emotional and value-based attitude to the world and people, as well as a system of moral and ethical ideas that determine a person's behaviour in various real-life situations [16].

Humanization and humanitarization of education induce the unity of professional, cultural and moral development of a personality. A well-known Ukrainian psychologist H. Ball distinguishes the central idea of humanizing education as orientation of the goals, essence, forms and methods of influence on the education applicant, and humanization of his development. He believes that the most important elements in humanization of education are as follows: humanistic reconsideration of main functions of education; humanisation of life for every pupil; implementation of humanistic foundations in the general organization of the education system; educators' love and respect for pupils / students; stimulation for development of subjective qualities in education applicants; introduction of dialogic principles in education; bringing up pupils / students in the spirit of humanistic values; development and activities of an educator as a subject of humanistically oriented education [22].

Hence, humanization and humanitarization of education in the context of its democratization should realize the person-oriented teaching aimed at humanization of socio-economic, civil-political and socio-cultural environment. That is, all those humanistic criteria of the educational

process that are required for development of creative abilities and skills of education applicants. Humanization and humanitarization should cover all stages of continuous education, from preschool education to post-qualifying education (“lifelong learning”). At the same time, it is the classical university education, which has always set the framework for implementing the principles of freedom for education and person, and which provides the most suitable basis for all-round development of a personality. As pointed out by V. Briukhovetskyi, President of National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, only “in universities we can create such conditions that enable a person to bring their talent to light and understand what it is. One can create conditions for a person to feel the taste of freedom: just like a tree bud breaks in spring, the person will “open up” and suddenly realize what a great benefit it is to be free. To speak and act as you wish – of course, within certain limits of social norms and rules, but the way you want, and not the way you are ordered. These are the two things that only a true university can do” [23]. Hence the main task of a university consists in forming such a level of freedom that enables a person to implement their own life project in the form of a social contribution. In the opinion of L. Ryzhak, humanization and humanitarization of education are facilitated by the freedom of university life itself which covers various dimensions, from personal to institutional. These are interrelated, as cooperation between universities opens opportunities for mutual exchange of students and teachers both within the country and across the globe; use of foreign curricula, textbooks and other literature, as well as computer and network-based technologies. The principle of freedom in education envisages a wide autonomy for universities and democratization of their lives [24].

It is well-known that values direct, organize, and orientate a person's behaviour to determine the goals of their activity. A person cognizes the world through the prism of values which regulate social behaviour

throughout life. In accordance with the humanistic theory of A. Maslow and K. Rogers, modern education: originates from universal human values adjusted to suit specific values of various ethnic cultures; strives for self-actualization of personality; focuses on personal development on the basis of entirety and unity of mind and feelings, body and soul; ensures a person's right to free choice of contents, forms and modes of education; is implemented with state and public support, attention, and cooperation rather than with formal management on the part of the authority [25].

The axiological platform of democratization of education is based on humanistic and at the same time universal human values which include as follows: human rights, tolerance, justice, solidarity, environmental safety. Human rights are of special relevance today, while they act as an institutional, moral, ethics and civilization basis of the European values declared at the national and international level in conditions of democratization of social life, management and education. Human rights outline the boundaries of state authority by delimiting the field of citizens' life where the state cannot interfere, and the duties that the state has to fulfil in relation to its citizens. The priority of human rights over the rights of the state is the fundamental value of democracy. As a political system, democracy originated and is developing primarily within the state with which its main institutions are connected. That is why the issue of correlation between the human rights and the rights of the state emerges against the background of social-legal nature of the state. For example, O. Skrypniuk in his work "Social and legal state in Ukraine. Problems of theory and practice" emphasizes that the idea of a legal state provides for restricting its power to the benefit of the civil society and priority of citizens' rights over rights of the state, and the social nature of the state is directed towards ensuring civil rights for every member of the society [26]. In his turn, V. Horbatenko points out that human rights and freedoms are the value represented in all forms

and procedures of democracy. In fact, democracy exists to protect and implement this value. It makes sense when every person is a carrier of certain inalienable rights and freedoms, even when many citizens neglect and disrespect these rights. A constitutional legal order in the framework of democracy is a system of relations that provides everyone with the highest possible extent of freedom of self-determination and self-activity [27].

Democratic political education is built on determination of main humanistic values, primarily freedom and dignity of every personality, and their natural inherent rights. It helps every citizen to evaluate the corresponding social order properly, realize their place and role in the state, their rights and duties. As noted by V. Bereza, the main goal of political education is to teach a person how to find bearings in the complicated and contradictory world, represent and protect their interests with respect for interests and rights of others, and how to solve common problems together [28].

Tolerance as “respect, perception and understanding of the rich variety of cultures in this world” [29] is an integral element of patriotism of the 21st century, which is characterized not only with love of one’s nation, but also with respect for others, respect for every person regardless of their race, nationality, citizenship, religious beliefs etc. In H. Tkachenko’s opinion, it requires, first of all, to form a high culture of inter-ethnic communication, which should be based on the following humanistic principles: respect for a citizen guaranteed by his respect for others; adherence to cultural norms of freedom of speech; resolution of conflicts and contradictions based on preserving the opponent’s dignity; a person as the foundation, beginning and end of society [30].

Today, the most suitable and effective way of bringing up the younger generation and inculcating tolerance and respect for people of a different culture, religion, nationality or worldview is the multi-ethnic educational

environment. Ye. Tvoryn points out that justice as one of the forms of moral behaviour and a fundamental value of ethical consciousness is considered at this stage mostly in a complex with other categories such as benevolence, freedom, respectfulness, and equality [31]. As a moral category, justice evaluates social reality which should be preserved or achieved. As a political value, it means, first of all, an equal freedom for all, the equality of rights and equality of everyone before the law. In addition, justice envisages equal opportunities for development of individual abilities and aspirations for everyone, and social support for personal efforts. That is why justice is incompatible with destruction of individuality or amputation of personality. **Z. Shevchenko points out that** social justice strives for equality in the freedom of self-determination and self-actualization of every person. Observing the principle of social justice in conditions of democratization of the social space should ensure proper social mobility which enables every person to reach their social level with their own efforts, and achieve the social status they deserve. Natural and social differentiation of society members, which is a foundation of democracy and is supported by democracy, should acquire a positive meaning and be regulated by equality of rights [32].

As a social phenomenon, solidarity is characterized by horizontal ties (relations) of cooperation and interaction as opposed to vertical ties of authority and dependence. Classic sociology authors (A. Comte, E. Durkheim, M. Kovalevskyi) interpret solidarity as the main force that rallies the society and creates things common for everyone. In the modern sense, solidarity is characterized as the unity of beliefs and actions, mutual aid and support between members of a social group, mutual guarantees and joint responsibility. A Russian researcher A. Okara notes that solidarity can be defined as a principle of social existence that envisages situations when subjects of social relations combine resources and opportunities to

achieve common goals. Meanwhile, interests of every subject should be in balance with interests of the community. In the scientist's opinion, solidarity should be viewed as a mechanism of social regulation, preservation and development of a collective organism, which helps to make the most of all society members' opportunities for the sake of their individual and common good [33]. As a scientific problem, solidarity is considered in modern discourse along with such ethical elements of existence as ethics of nonviolence, the problem of trust and loyalty, and it is also connected to them with mechanisms of self-organization and synergetic interaction, the soft power technology etc [34].

Conclusions. *It has been established that justice and solidarity, as two civil values and principles of social organization, can be recreated in the educational process on all levels of continuous education, and they can serve as the basis for out-of-school and extracurricular work.* It has been clarified that in conditions of a global environmental crisis leaving little time for mankind to solve the problem of survival, environmental safety appears as a top-priority value of the highest order, and to be solved, it requires the use of all means of educational influence at various stages of preparing the new generation to life. Differences of democratic values have been established; such values can be only acquired indirectly at early stages of a child's socialization; environmental safety values are internalised since early childhood through gradual cognition of the environment. The article reveals universal democratic values, particularly human rights, tolerance, solidarity and environmental safety, along with peacefulness and merely moral values of mercy, conscience and responsibility, which form the basis for the Pedagogical Constitution of Europe that determines the principles and methodology for philosophy and policy of training a new teacher for the united Europe of the 21st century. Results of the analysis indicate that modernization of the education system in Ukraine at its present-day stage is

directed towards development of fundamental science, as well as Ukrainian and global cultural values; also, there is orientation on the ideals of democracy and humanism as the key to existence and development of the civil society.

It has been established that the human-centred direction of education appears as the essential characteristics of the process of its democratization when the human becomes the focus of the educational process, its main subject and primary goal. Development of a humanistic direction in education, in the context of its democratization, is related to overcoming the phenomenon of technocracism as a way of thinking and acting. Humanization envisages recognition of a person's value as a personality, and humanitarization of education provides knowledge about man and forms humanistic interpersonal relations. As two interdependent processes of education, humanization and humanitarization ensure the unity of professional, cultural and moral development of a personality. Humanization and humanitarization of education are most facilitated by the freedom of university life which covers various dimensions, from personal to institutional. The axiological platform of democratization of education is based on humanistic values and at the same time universal human values which include human rights, tolerance, justice, solidarity, and environmental safety. Along with peacefulness and other moral values, the abovementioned democratic values have laid the basis for the Pedagogical Constitution of Europe.

References:

1. Кондур О.С. (2018) Управління якістю освітніх систем в умовах глобалізації: теорія, методика організації, практика: монографія. Івано-Франківськ: НАІР, 488 с.

2. Кремень В.Г. (2011) Філософія людиноцентризму в освітньому просторі. 2-е видання. Київ : Т-во «Знання» України. 520с.
3. Вишневський О. (2008) Людиноцентризм як педагогічна проблема на тлі сучасних цивілізаційних процесів. *Освіта: всеукраїнський громадсько-політичний тижневик*. № 32/ 33. С. 10–11.
4. Андрущенко В.П., Андрущенко Т.В., Савельєв В.Л. (2014) Конституціалізація освітнього простору Європи: аксіологічний вимір. Київ: «МП Леся», 460с.
5. Гончаренко С.У. (1997) Український педагогічний словник. Київ: Либідь. 376 с.
6. Ковальчук В. Людиноцентризм як гуманістично орієнтований підхід до формування нової людини (2014). *Обрії*. № 1 (38). С. 32–34.
7. Інклюзивна освіта. *Інститут спеціальної педагогіки і психології імені Миколи Ярмаченка Національної академії педагогічних наук України* <http://ispukr.org.ua/?page_id=331#.YL0sq_n7SUK > (2021, січень, 12).
8. Тоффлер Э. (2003) Шок будущего. Москва: ООО «Издательство АСТ». 557 с.
9. Рябенко Є.М. (2014) Принцип людиноцентризму в управління вищою освітою: мотиваційні аспекти професійної діяльності викладача як суб'єкта освітнього процесу. *Гуманітарний вісник ЗДІА*. № 56. С. 33–42.
10. Даль В.И. (2000) Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка: в 4 т. Москва: Русский язык. Т. 1: А-З. 699с.
11. Романенко М.І. (2001) Гуманізація освіти: концептуальні проблеми та практичний досвід : монографія. Дніпропетровськ: Промінь. С. 34–39.

12. Силкіна С.О. (2012) Парадигма гуманізму в контексті сучасного філософського дискурсу. *Культура і сучасність: збірник наукових праць*. Київ: Міленіум. № 2. 262 с.
13. Сакун А. (2012) Проблема гуманізації освіти в контексті особисто-орієнтованого підходу. *Філософські обрії*. № 28. С. 193–201.
14. Євсович Р.В. (2012) Гуманізація та гуманітаризація вищої освіти в Україні: історичний контекст. *Духовність особистості: методологія, теорія і практика*. № 5 (52). С. 79–87.
15. Возняк В.С. (2008) Співвідношення розсудку і розуму як філософсько-педагогічна проблема. Дрогобич: Редакційно-видавничий відділ Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету ім. Івана Франка. 357 с.
16. Гончар О.В. (2010) Педагогічна взаємодія як ключова складова гуманізації навчального процесу у вищому навчальному закладі. *Наукові записки. Серія: Педагогіка*. № 2. С. 62–66.
17. Сущенко Т.І. (2014) Важливі тенденції суспільного розвитку та їх вплив на посилення педагогізації освітніх процесів. *Педагогіка формування творчої особистості у вищій і загальноосвітній школах*. Вип. 35 (88). С. 323–330.
18. Шаргун Т.О. (2013) Гуманізація професійної підготовки майбутніх фахівців залізничного транспорту. *Педагогіка формування творчої особистості у вищій і загальноосвітній школах*. Вип. 29. С. 102–108.
19. Цимбалюк Н.М., Калініченко В.І. (2010) Проблеми гуманітаризації вищої освіти в Україні. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В.Н. Каразіна*. №891 С. 176-179.
20. Євсович Р.В. (2013) Тезарусний підход до визначення поняття гуманізація та гуманітризація вищої освіти. *Духовність особистості: методологія, теорія і практика*. № 2 (55). С. 58–68.

21. Брежнева С. (2015) Визначення змісту основних принципів гуманізації навчально-виховного процесу молодших школярів на уроках музичного мистецтва. *Молодь і ринок*. №1 (120). С. 137 –141.
22. Балл Г.О. (1999) Гуманізація освіти в контексті сучасності: психолого-педагогічні орієнтири. *Освіта і управління*. № 3. С. 21–34.
23. Брюховецький В. (2001) Києво-Могилянська академія: десять років відновлення. *Вища школа*. № 2-3. С. 3–21.
24. Ryzhak L. (2008) Humanization of higher education in Ukraine in the context of the Bologna process. *Socio-humanitarian problems of human*. Issue 3. P. 14–22.
25. Барліт О. (2013) Аксіологічні аспекти громадянської освіти. *Актуальні проблеми громадянської освіти: український та зарубіжний досвід: матеріали Першої науково-практичної конференції* (Острог, 19 черв. 2013 р.) / відп. ред. О. С. Батищева. Острог: ГО «Центр демократичного лідерства, Національний університет «Острозька академія». С. 27-29.
26. Скрипнюк О.В. (2000) Соціальна, правова держава в Україні. Проблеми теорії і практики. Київ: [Б.в.], 2000. 600 с.
27. Горбатенко В. (2006) Ценностные аспекты реформирования политической системы Украины. *Политический менеджмент*. № 3. С. 9–12.
28. Береза В. (2015) Демократизація суспільних відносин як головна умова функціонування політичної системи і просвітництва. *Вісник інституту розвитку дитини. Серія. Філософія. Педагогіка. Психологія: збірник наукових праць*. Київ: Вид-во НПУ ім. М. П. Драгоманова. Вип. 37. С. 10–17.
29. Декларация принципов терпимости. Утверждена резолюцией 5.61 Генеральной конференции ЮНЕСКО от 16 ноября 1995 года (1995).

Законодавство України. <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_503 > (2021, січень, 12).

30. Ткаченко Г. (2013) Деякі аспекти гуманізації освіти в контексті глобалізації і вимог Болонського процесу. *Нова педагогічна думка*. № 1.2. С. 15–18.

31. Творин Є.Б. (2005) Справедливість як необхідна умова суспільного розвитку. *Мультиверсум: філософський альманах*. № 48. <<http://multiversum.com.ua/index.php/journal/issue/archive> > (2021, січень, 12).

32. Шевченко З.В. (2007) Соціальна справедливість як головний чинник суспільної диференціації в умовах демократизації соціального простору. *Матеріали V Міжнародної конференції: Розвиток демократії і демократична освіта в Україні. Тези доповідей. 8-10 листопада 2007 р.* Київ, С. 30.

33. Окара А. (2010) Социальная солидарность как основа нового «миростроительного» проекта. *Перспективы*. <<http://www.perspektivy.info/print.php?ID=51931> > (2021, січень, 12).

34. Ridei N., Pavlenko D., Plakhotnik O., Gorokhova T., Popova A. Concept of forming the company innovation strategy. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 2019, 18 (Special Issue 1), p. 1-6.

References:

1. Kondur O.S. (2018) Upravlinnia yakistiu osvitnikh system v umovakh hlobalizatsii: teoriia, metodyka orhanizatsii, praktyka: monohrafiia. Ivano-Frankivsk: NAIR, 488 s. [in Ukrainian].

2. Kremen V.H. (2011) Filosofiia liudynotsentryzmu v osvithomu prostori. 2-e vydannia. Kyiv: T-vo «Znannia» Ukrainy. 520s. [in Ukrainian].

3. Vyshnevskiy O. (2008) Liudynotsentryzm yak pedahohichna problema na tli suchasnykh tsyvilizatsiinykh protsesiv. *Osvita : vseukrainskyi hromadsko-politychnyi tyzhnevyyk*. № 32/ 33. S. 10–11. [in Ukrainian].

4. Andrushchenko V.P., Andrushchenko T. V., Saveliev V.L. (2014) Konstytutsializatsiia osvithnoho prostoru Yevropy: aksiolohichni vymir. Kyiv: «MP Lesia», 460s. [in Ukrainian].
5. Honcharenko S.U. (1997) Ukrainskyi pedahohichniy slovnyk. Kyiv: Lybid. 376 s. [in Ukrainian].
6. Kovalchuk V. Liudynotsentryzm yak humanistychno oriientovanyi pidkhyd do formuvannia novoi liudyny (2014). Obrii. № 1 (38). S. 32–34. [in Ukrainian].
7. Inkluzyvna osvita. Instytut spetsialnoi pedahohiky i psykholohii imeni Mykoly Yarmachenka Natsionalnoi akademii pedahohichnykh nauk Ukrainy <http://ispukr.org.ua/?page_id=331#.YL0sq_n7SUK > (2021, sichen, 12). [in Ukrainian].
8. Toffler Ə. (2003) Shok budushcheho. Moskva: OOO «Yzdatelstvo AST». 557 s. [in Ukrainian].
9. Riabenko Ye.M. (2014) Pryntsyp liudynotsentryzmu v upravlinnia vyshchoiu osvitoiu: motyvatsiini aspekty profesiinoi diialnosti vykladacha yak subiekta osvithnoho protsesu. Humanitarnyi visnyk ZDIA. № 56. S. 33–42. [in Ukrainian].
10. Dal' V.I. (2000) Tolkovyj slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo yazyka: v 4 t. Moskva: Russkij yazyk. T. 1: A-Z. 699s. [in Russian].
11. Romanenko M.I. (2001) Humanizatsiia osvity: kontseptualni problemy ta praktychnyi dosvid: monohrafiia. Dnipropetrovsk: Promin. S. 34–39. [in Ukrainian].
12. Sylkina S.O. (2012) Paradyhma humanizmu v konteksti suchasnoho filosofskoho dyskursu. Kultura i suchasnist: zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Kyiv: Milenium. № 2. 262 s. [in Ukrainian].
13. Sakun A. (2012) Problema humanizatsii osvity v konteksti osobysto-oriientovanoho pidkhydu. Filosofski obrii. № 28. S. 193–201. [in Ukrainian].

14. Ievsovykh R.V. (2012) Humanizatsiia ta humanitaryzatsiia vyshchoi osvity v Ukraini: istorychnyi kontekst. Dukhovnist osobystosti: metodolohiia, teoriia i praktyka. № 5 (52). S. 79–87. [in Ukrainian].
15. Vozniak V.S. (2008) Spivvidnoshennia rozsudku i rozumu yak filosofsko-pedahohichna problema. Drohobych: Redaktsiino-vydavnychi viddil Drohobyskoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu im. Ivana Franka. 357 s. [in Ukrainian].
16. Honchar O.V. (2010) Pedahohichna vzaiemodiia yak kliuchova skladova humanizatsii navchalnoho protsesu u vyshchomu navchalnomu zakladi. Naukovi zapysky. Seriia : Pedahohika. № 2. S. 62–66. [in Ukrainian].
17. Sushchenko T.I. (2014) Vazhlyvi tendentsii suspilnoho rozvytku ta yikh vplyv na posylennia pedahohizatsii osvitnikh protsesiv. Pedahohika formuvannia tvorchoi osobystosti u vyshchii i zahalnoosvitnii shkolakh. Vyp. 35 (88). S. 323–330. [in Ukrainian].
18. Sharhun T.O. (2013) Humanizatsiia profesiinoi pidhotovky maibutnikh fakhivtsiv zaliznychnoho transportu. Pedahohika formuvannia tvorchoi osobystosti u vyshchii i zahalnoosvitnii shkolakh. Vyp. 29. S. 102–108. [in Ukrainian].
19. Tsymbaliuk N.M., Kalinichenko V.I. (2010) Problemy humanitaryzatsii vyshchoi osvity v Ukraini. Visnyk Kharkivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni V.N. Karazina. №891 S. 176-179. [in Ukrainian].
20. Ievsovykh R.V. (2013) Tezarusnyi pidkhod do vyznachennia poniattia humanizatsiia ta humanitaryzatsiia vyshchoi osvity. Dukhovnist osobystosti: metodolohiia, teoriia i praktyka. № 2 (55). S. 58–68. [in Ukrainian].
21. Brezhneva S. (2015) Vyznachennia zmistu osnovnykh pryntsypiv humanizatsii navchalno-vykhovnoho protsesu molodshykh shkoliariv na urokakh muzychnoho mystetstva. Molod i rynok. №1 (120).S. 137 –141. [in Ukrainian].

22. Ball H.O. (1999) Humanizatsiia osvity v konteksti suchasnosti: psykholoho-pedahohichni oriientyry. Osvita i upravlinnia. № 3. S. 21–34. [in Ukrainian].
23. Briukhovetskyi V. (2001) Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia: desiat rokiv vidnovlennia. Vyshcha shkola. № 2-3. S. 3–21. [in Ukrainian].
24. Ryzhak L. (2008) Humanization of higher education in Ukraine in the context of the Bologna process. *Socio-humanitarian problems of human*. Issue 3. P. 14–22. [in English].
25. Barlit O. (2013) Aksiolohichni aspekty hromadianskoi osvity. Aktualni problemy hromadianskoi osvity: ukrainskyi ta zarubizhnyi dosvid: materialy Pershoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii (Ostroh, 19 cherv. 2013 r.) / vidp. red. O. S. Batishcheva. Ostroh: HO «Tsentr demokratychnoho liderstva, Natsionalnyi universytet «Ostrozka akademiia». S. 27-29. [in Ukrainian].
26. Skrypniuk O.V. (2000) Sotsialna, pravova derzhava v Ukraini. Problemy teorii i praktyky. Kyiv: [B.v.], 2000. 600 s. [in Ukrainian].
27. Gorbatenko V. (2006) Czennostny`e aspekty` reformirovaniya politicheskoy sistemy` Ukrainy`. Politicheskij menedzhment. № 3. S. 9–12. [in Russian].
28. Bereza V. (2015) Demokratyzatsiia supilnykh vidnosyn yak holovna umova funktsionuvannia politychnoi systemy i prosvitnytstva. Visnyk instytutu rozvytku dytyny. Seriia. Filosofiia. Pedahohika. Psykholohiia: zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Kyiv: Vyd-vo NPU im. M. P. Drahomanova. Vyp. 37. S. 10–17. [in Ukrainian].
29. Deklaratsiia pryntsypov terpyimosti. Utverzhdena rezoliutsiei 5.61 Heneralnoi konferentsyy YuNESKO ot 16 noiabria 1995 hoda (1995). Zakonodavstvo Ukrainy. <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_503 > (2021, sichen, 12). [in Ukrainian].

30. Tkachenko H. (2013) Deiaki aspekty humanizatsii osvity v konteksti hlobalizatsii i vymoh Bolonskoho protsesu. Nova pedahohichna dumka. № 1.2. S. 15–18. [in Ukrainian].
31. Tvoryn Ye.B. (2005) Spravedlyvist yak neobkhidna umova suspilnoho rozvytku. Multyversum: filosofskyi almanakh. № 48. <<http://multiversum.com.ua/index.php/journal/issue/archive> > (2021, sichen, 12). [in Ukrainian].
32. Shevchenko Z.V. (2007) Sotsialna spravedlyvist yak holovnyi chynnyk suspilnoi dyferentsiatsii v umovakh demokratyzatsii sotsialnoho prostoru. Materialy V Mizhnarodnoi konferentsii: Rozvytok demokratii i demokratychna osvita v Ukraini. Tezy dopovidei. 8-10 lystopada 2007 r. Kyiv, S. 30. [in Ukrainian].
33. Okara A. (2010) Soczial'naya solidarnost' kak osnova novogo «mirostroytel'nogo» proekta. Perspektivy. <<http://www.perspektivy.info/print.php?ID=51931> > (2021, si`chen`, 12). [in Russian].
34. Ridei N., Pavlenko D., Plakhotnik O., Gorokhova T., Popova A. Concept of forming the company innovation strategy. Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 2019, 18 (Special Issue 1), p. 1-6. [in English].

Citation: I. M. Syladiy (2021). AXIOLOGICAL AND ACMEOLOGICAL ASPECTS IN DEMOCRATIZATION OF EDUCATION. Frankfurt. TK Meganom LLC. Paradigm of knowledge. 1(45). doi: 10.26886/2520-7474.1(45)2021.12

Copyright I. M. Syladiy ©. 2021. This is an openaccess article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.