



Modern View on the Formation of Students' Worldview in the Pedagogical Heritage of K.D. Ushinskii

VALERII N. KAZANTSEV

The Academy of the FPS of Russia, Ryazan, Russia, v.cazantsev2010@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-002-3016-0414>

NINA A. TYUGAEVA

The Academy of the FPS of Russia, Ryazan, Russia, upip2009@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5799-3872>

Abstract

Introduction: formation of students' worldview is the most important element in any pedagogical system. Pedagogical heritage of K.D. Ushinskii is not an exception. The article describes evolution of K.D. Ushinskii's views on the formation of the worldview of students, analyzes its components, determines correlation between his pedagogical teaching and socio-economic development of Russia in the mid-19th century, philosophical and pedagogical teachings of his predecessors and contemporaries. The main idea of K.D. Ushinskii, which determines the entire system of education, is the inseparable connection of domestic education and upbringing with folk culture and modern needs of society and the state. There are three cornerstones of K.D. Ushinskii's pedagogical teaching, such as nationality, religiosity and scientificity. *Purpose:* to consider and analyze an aspect of the pedagogical system of K.D. Ushinskii, such as formation of the worldview of students, which determines all the other parts of his pedagogical system, to find those elements in his concept that remain relevant at the present time and can be used as guiding ideas in modern domestic pedagogy. *Methods:* to comprehensively analyze K.D. Ushinskii's point of view on the ideas of philosophers known at that time, the authors used the method of content analysis of mentions of the names of these philosophers in the two-volume edition of his fundamental work "Man as a subject of education". The method of comparative analysis and the historical method were also actively used. *Results:* the authors have considered formation of the worldview of students in the pedagogical system of K.D. Ushinskii from the standpoint of modernity in the philosophical and sociological aspect, indicating those moments in his concept that were relevant at the beginning of the 19th century and can be used as guiding ideas in modern Russian pedagogy. Distinguishing in the complex concept "worldview" its three components known in philosophy, such as attitude to life (emotional-psychological side), perception of the world (image of the world in visual sensory representations obtained as a result of sensory perception of the surrounding world) and philosophy of life (cognitive-intellectual side of the worldview), the authors conclude that the fact that three cornerstones of K.D. Ushinskii's pedagogical system (nationality, religiosity and scientificity) allow forming all these components of the worldview. *Conclusions:* philosophical views of K.D. Ushinskii developed from objective idealism to

dualism and incomplete materialism, close to dialectical materialism. Religiosity of education and upbringing evolved in the pedagogical system, becoming an applied educational aspect that helps to better master folk culture, without which no national education is possible. Such an element of the pedagogical system as scientificity also changed, which he considered in two aspects: the scientific character of pedagogy itself, based on knowledge of anthropology and other sciences, and scientific character as the formation of a scientific picture of the world, acquisition of knowledge of natural and social sciences, which allow students to master professions that meet their interests and needs of the society at that time. Relying on the variability and development of nature and society, which presupposes constant correction of education and nutrition in accordance with these changes, it is necessary to abandon dogmas and established standards of education and upbringing, adapting the education system to new realities of public life. K.D. Ushinskii considered pedagogy at the same time as science and art. In addition to knowledge, pedagogy also requires pedagogical abilities and inclinations, enriched with data from many anthropological sciences.

Key words: worldview; student; pedagogical system; K.D. Ushinskii; anthropology; interrelation; society; modernity.

5.8.1. General pedagogy, history of pedagogy and education.

For citation: Kazantsev V.N., Tyugaeva N.A. Modern view on the formation of students' worldview in the pedagogical heritage of K.D. Ushinskii. *Penitentiary Science*, 2023, vol. 17, no. 4 (64), pp. 442–450. doi 10.46741/2686-9764.2023.64.4.012.

Introduction

February 2023 marked the 200th anniversary of the birth of one of the largest representatives of Russian scientific pedagogy of the 19th century – Konstantin D. Ushinskii (1823–1870), whose pedagogical legacy has left a deep mark not only on Russian but also on world pedagogy.

The purpose of this article is to consider and analyze such an aspect of K.D. Ushinskii's pedagogical system as the formation of students' worldview, which determines all other parts of his pedagogical system, to find those elements in his concept that remain relevant at the present time and can be used as guiding ideas in modern Russian pedagogy.

The authors propose to trace development of K.D. Ushinskii's views on the formation of students' worldview, analyze its components and connection of his pedagogical teaching with the socio-economic development of Russia in the mid-19th century and philosophical and pedagogical teachings of that time. To comprehensively study K.D. Ushinskii's attitude to philosophers known at that time, the authors used the methodology of content analysis of references to philosophers' names in the two-

volume edition of his main fundamental work "Man as a subject of education" [1; 2].

Results and discussion

K.D. Ushinskii was an all-round man, fluent in German, English and French, familiar with all philosophical teachings that existed at the beginning of the 20th century (Aristotle, Bacon, Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Hume, Kant, etc.) and works of French enlighteners of that time (Rousseau, Holbach, Diderot, Julien Offray de La Mettrie, etc.). As for his own philosophical views and worldview, both K.D. Ushinskii's contemporaries and subsequent generations of scientists attributed them to different philosophical schools and teachings. Thus, even in pre-revolutionary studies, his worldview was interpreted from diametrically opposite positions. Some (for example, M. Rubinstein) considered him a consistent idealist, a supporter of Fichte's doctrine; others (for example, Professor M. Vladislavlev) – a materialist.

Representatives of church mysticism (P. Filonov, M. Radonezhskii and others) criticized K.D. Ushinskii from the standpoint of clericalism, calling him a materialist nihilist. Moreover, they wrote denunciations against

him claiming him an atheist and an unreliable person and pointing out the ignorance of religious materials in his textbooks. Though they demanded a textbook "Native Word" to be removed from schools, it had been a guidebook for teachers and parents on teaching native language for many decades. It is worth noting that it had been reprinted 146 times until 1917. Some (for example, I. Skvortsov and V. Goltsov) reproached K.D. Ushinskii for the dualistic duality of his teaching. And each of them was right in his own way.

Such different interpretations of K.D. Ushinskii's philosophical views, in our opinion, are explained by the fact that, indeed, they were quite contradictory and specific. In addition, they evolved throughout his life from idealistic to materialistic.

In order to confirm this conclusion, the authors applied their own methodology of content analysis of references to the most famous philosophers of antiquity and modernity in the main two-volume fundamental work of K.D. Ushinskii "Man as a subject of education". The semantic units of analysis were surnames of the philosophers mentioned and considered by K.D. Ushinskii in the eighth and ninth volumes of his complete works; the observation units were pages on which these surnames were mentioned. Table 1 shows the results of a frequency analysis of such references, revealing the diversity of philosophical schools and philosophers themselves considered by K.D. Ushinskii in his fundamental work (only philosophers mentioned 5 or more times in the text are taken for analysis).

*Number of reference to philosophers' names in K.D. Ushinskii's work
"Man as a subject of education"*

Table 1

No.	Philosophers	Frequency of references		
		Volume 8	Volume 9	Total
1	Aristotle	37	41	78
2	F. Beneke	45	39	84
3	F. Brown	-	28	28
4	F. Bacon	32	2	34
5	Wundt W.	27	6	33
6	G. Hegel	14	26	40
7	J. Herbart	24	59	83
8	R. Descartes	17	42	59
9	I. Kant	24	37	61
10	A. Comte	5	2	7
11	G. Leibniz	9	3	12
12	J. Locke	21	12	33
13	H. Lotze	6	2	8
14	J. Lewis	12	-	12
15	J. Mill	26	18	44
16	Plato	8	-	8
17	T. Reed	21	19	40
18	J.J. Rousseau	16	12	28
19	H. Spencer	14	3	17
20	B. Spinoza	8	55	63
21	I. Fichte	11	3	14
22	J. Fries	7	-	7
23	A. Schopenhauer	4	20	24
24	D. Hume	5	-	5

If we rank philosophers listed in the table according to the frequency of references, then the first half of this list (with at least 30 references) will include F. Beneke (a German psychologist and philosopher, teacher, developer of pedagogy based on empirical psychology data (84 refer-

ences)), J. Herbart (a German philosopher, psychologist and teacher of reactionary directions (83 references)), Aristotle (a philosopher-encyclopedist of ancient Greece (78 references)), and Spinoza (a famous European philosopher of the 17th century (63 references)) (Table 2).

Table 2

Ranking of the twelve most mentioned philosophers in K.D. Ushinskii's work "Man as a subject of education"

No.	Philosophers	Frequency of references		
		Volume 8	Volume 9	Total
1	F. Beneke	45	39	84
2	J. Herbart	24	59	83
3	Aristotle	37	41	78
4	B. Spinoza	8	55	63
5	I. Kant	24	37	61
6	R. Descartes	17	42	59
7	J. Mill	26	18	44
8	G. Hegel	14	26	40
9	T. Reed	21	19	40
10	F. Bacon	32	2	34
11	Wundt W.	27	6	33
12	J. Locke	21	12	33

The table shows that K.D. Ushinskii considered ideas of philosophers of various directions of philosophical thought (subjective and objective idealism, materialism, dualism, etc.) when developing his pedagogical concept. He described strong and weak points in each teaching, noting their one-sidedness: extreme idealism – in an effort to bring the material world out of the spiritual, extreme materialism – in an effort to bring the spiritual world out of the material. Ultimately, based on the practical needs of pedagogy, he chose dualism, according to which it is impossible to say what is primary: material or spiritual, since they coexist as if in parallel, being in close interaction. Backing the stance of H. Lotze, K.D. Ushinskii spread the ideas of dualism. It required great "independence in thought and noble courage in character", since dualism was subjected to harsh criticism at that time, both on the part of materialists and idealists. Analyzing teachings of R. Descartes and F. Bacon, K.D. Ushinskii came to the conclusion that they surprisingly "combined skepticism, idealism and materialism".

In this regard, we can recall R. Rolland's statement about the French writer J. Renan, "Taking away the image of my stoic, who is both an Epicurean, a pessimist-optimist, a believer and a doubter, a true man and a man of truth, I think about the audacity of those who try to lock this harmony of contradictions into the formula of a certain party or school. It contains rich music of a transitional time, burdened by the past, fraught with the future!" [3, p. 483]. These words of R. Rolland can rightfully be attributed to K.D. Ushinskii, who lived during the struggle of two opposing ways of socio-economic life in Russia. The feudal, serfdom system was replaced by a new system of capitalist production relations, requiring the development of science and appropriate education and upbringing. Undoubtedly, the influence of the epoch was reflected in the worldview of K.D. Ushinskii, who himself was well aware of the inconsistency of his philosophical views. Therefore, without fear of reproaches for recognizing dualism, following H. Lotze, K.D. Ushinskii rejected extremes of idealism, which takes the material world out of spiritual, and extremes of materialism, which

takes the spiritual world out of the material. According to his opinion and belief, two worlds coexist in a person: spiritual and material [4, p. 648].

K.D. Ushinskii considered pedagogy itself in two aspects: “in the broad sense”, as a collection of sciences aimed at teaching and upbringing, and pedagogy “in the narrow sense” as a theory of the art of education. Referring to J. Mill, he described relations between pedagogy as a science and pedagogy as an art. The latter sets science goals of its activity (education of a perfect person adapted to modern society, useful to this society and in harmony with itself, society and nature), and science, having received this goal as a task, explores, studies real possibilities of achieving this goal, and then transfers pedagogy as art in the form of “combinations of circumstances (conditions)”, with the help of which this goal can be achieved [1, p. 15].

The worldview is one of the important elements of pedagogy as a science and as an art that unites them into a single whole. Most often, it is understood as “a generalized system of human views on the world as a whole, on the place of individual phenomena in the world and on one’s own place in it, a person’s understanding and emotional assessment of the meaning of his activities and destinies of mankind, a set of scientific, philosophical, political, legal, moral, religious, aesthetic beliefs and ideals of people” [4, p. 454]. The authors understand the worldview, first of all, as a set of logically related and consistent fundamental views on nature, society and man, as well as social values, attitudes, and ideals of both an individual and certain small and large social groups. The core idea of K.D. Ushinskii, determining his entire system of education, is the inseparable connection between national education, folk culture and modern needs of society and the state.

We can talk about three cornerstones of K.D. Ushinskii’s pedagogical teaching: nationality, religiosity and scientificity. Nationality means the reliance of education on folk culture with its language, customs and traditions, adapted over a millennium of its development to climatic and historical conditions of its existence.

Religiosity (in relation to Russian culture it is, first of all, Orthodoxy), K.D. Ushinskii understood as a manifestation of the people’s cul-

ture, deeply religious at that time. Russian Orthodoxy, as an element not externally imposed on the Russian people, but formed on the basis of Russian folk culture, accumulated, according to K.D. Ushinskii, the best social values, customs and traditions that allow the younger generation to be brought up in harmony with nature, surrounding people and other peoples. Undoubtedly, the role of religiosity in the pedagogical teaching of K.D. Ushinskii underwent significant changes in the course of his life and scientific creativity. His later works and, above all, his fundamental two-volume work “Man as a subject of education. The experience of pedagogical anthropology” (1868–1869) suggest that under the influence of the third element of his pedagogical system – scientificity – the role of religion in teaching and upbringing gradually decreased and was considered as an element of nationality and a storehouse of folk wisdom.

He argued that psychology, on which pedagogy is based, “is even in more close relation to religious systems than history. It cannot but see observe not only expressions of the human soul, but even expressions in which some psychological truth should necessarily be hidden” [2, p. 560].

How right K.D. Ushinskii was and remains, noting the extreme importance of relying on nationality in any education (native language, native culture) and religiosity, is evidenced by the thirty-year experience of Ukrainization in terms of imposing the Ukrainian language on the entire population of Ukraine (especially in its eastern regions, where the Russian-speaking population has traditionally lived), refusal from canonical Orthodoxy and its replacement with a schismatic pseudo-Orthodox religion. In principle, our ideological opponents have taken into account the importance of nationality and religiosity in education and upbringing. Russian language, Russian culture, and canonical Orthodoxy, which united two fraternal peoples, have been violently eradicated throughout the territory of Ukraine. It should be said that they have succeeded in this in a certain way. The protest of the Russian-speaking population in the eastern regions of Ukraine against such artificial, forced Ukrainization since 2014, can also be understood. Education in Russian language is resumed in the territories liberated during the special military operation launched in Febru-

ary 2022 (the use of Ukrainian language is also permitted, as well as of Ukrainian and Tatar languages in the Republic of Crimea), and is based on Russian culture and Orthodox values.

For K.D. Ushinskii, scientificity is reliance not only on natural sciences (physics, chemistry, astronomy, etc.), but also psychology, biology and other anthropological disciplines. The essence of pedagogical anthropology is that education and upbringing of children should be based on the anthropological laws of the human body development from birth to adulthood. K.D. Ushinskii borrowed many ideas of pedagogical anthropology from the French enlighteners claiming that “all social phenomena come out of private psychic phenomena”. But he developed them further and connected them with other elements of his pedagogical system, including religiosity, considering it as a “historical form of the human psyche functioning” and a source of human wisdom and morality. A dogmatic exposition of the rules of the teaching of religion, according to K.D. Ushinskii, should be left to specialists in theology, while psychology and pedagogy consider Christianity (first of all, Orthodoxy) as a phenomenon arising from the needs of the human soul.

Thus, K.D. Ushinskii was the first among Russian teachers to attempt to summarize scientific knowledge about man, showing the relationship of pedagogy with anthropological science. In didactic terms this meant that when teaching, it was necessary to take into account biological and psychological features of the development of children of different ages. One should not teach a child with concrete imaginative thinking subjects that require more abstract thinking. In his main work “Man as a subject of education”, K.D. Ushinskii, based on a detailed description of human physiology and psychology, substantiates, in particular, why children cannot do one monotonous thing for a long time and why teaching for them should be visual.

These views of K.D. Ushinskii were later brilliantly confirmed by many studies of foreign and domestic scientists-psychologists. For example, the Swiss psychologist J. Piaget (1896–1980), having conducted numerous experiments and tests, showed how children’s mental abilities, skills and abilities changed depending on their age and interaction with the environment. He developed his theory of cognitive de-

velopment, better known as 4 stages of intellectual development [5]. J. Piaget empirically proved that all children go through a series of successive stages in their intellectual and mental development, gradually acquiring new skills of material handling, which determine the limits of possible cognition for them.

In Russian psychology, empirical confirmation of Ushinskii’s ideas can be also found in the works of Academician Pavlov stating that “sleep is the inhibition of central organs of the brain” and “habits and skills are “conditioned reflexes” [6; 7].

Russia made the transition from the feudal system and patriarchal way of life to the capitalist one, from handicraft production to large-scale capitalist production in the middle of the 19th century. Therefore, in contrast to the supporters of formal education, who seek to develop mental abilities of students in any suitable material, including “dead” languages, K.D. Ushinskii believed that children should get such knowledge in the field, first of all, of natural sciences, which would be useful to them when they entered adult working life. The education program, according to K.D. Ushinskii, should be derived from social existence and social needs, and pedagogical success is possible only when education is based on the rules of folk morality, developing together with them. It is this kind of upbringing and education that can contribute to prepare new generations for life in society.

As a supporter of real education, K.D. Ushinskii not only promoted the possibility of teaching knowledge in physics, chemistry and other natural sciences, but also tried to implement his ideas in practice. Being appointed to the position of inspector at the Smolny Institute of Noble Maidens in 1859 by the favor of Empress Mariya Feodorovna attracted by his articles in the Journal for Education, he introduced new subjects into the curriculum, such as Russian language, the best works of Russian literature, and natural sciences (fundamentals of physics, chemistry, and biology). At the same time, visibility was widely used in teaching and experiments were conducted in biology and physics.

Besides, K.D. Ushinskii invited such prominent teachers as V.I. Vodovozov (literature), D.D. Semenov (geography), M.I. Semevskii (history) and others. To promote socially useful work among students, in addition to the man-

datory seven classes of general education, a two-year pedagogical class was introduced. After its completion, young people could work at elementary school.

Before that, at the Smolny Institute, girls had been given very little real knowledge, they had learnt secular manners and prepared for family life as a wife and mother. Naturally, some reactionary teachers of this educational institution, close to the royal court, disputed the ideas of K.D. Ushinskii. Therefore, denunciations of the reformer teacher achieved their goal and he was dismissed. However, due to his fame as a scientist-teacher, the leadership decided to send K.D. Ushinskii on a long business trip abroad to get acquainted with the experience of pedagogical female education in a number of European countries.

It should be said that the rich material collected by K.D. Ushinskii on this business trip only strengthened his conviction that education and upbringing should be based on national characteristics and the specifics of folk culture. On the other hand, it is necessary to borrow the experience, achievements of foreign scientists, and pedagogical technologies, especially in the field of teaching natural sciences.

According to K.D. Ushinskii, "an industrial direction of the century requires industrial science" that children should be introduced to the sciences of nature and man. They should know their native language and literature, history, geography, and mathematics. Natural sciences are very important for a person. K.D. Ushinskii sharply criticized classicism in high school, which was strongly supported by the reactionary Minister of Public Education D.A. Tolstoi. In one of his last articles "What should we do with our children?" written in 1868 [8], arguing with the defenders of classicism in education, K.D. Ushinskii proved the enormous educational significance of natural science and defended the real direction of general education. He pointed out that natural sciences develop the ability to observe life, interest children incomparably more than Latin and Greek declensions and conjugations, contribute to the development of logical thinking and are of great practical importance. In his book for reading "Child world" [9], K.D. Ushinskii presented a lot of educational material on natural science for initial training. He strongly recommended introduction of

practical classes for students, especially rural schools, in the garden and field. Such classes developed skills of hard work, contributed to the acquisition of initial knowledge for further professional self-determination, the choice of professions that modern society needs. K.D. Ushinskii considered the training itself as mental work that requires volitional efforts on the part of students.

K.D. Ushinskii's arguments about the propensity for entertainment are very relevant for our time. In the second volume of his essay "Man as a subject of education" in Chapter XLVI "Pursuit of pleasure and pursuit of happiness: the classical theory of Eudaemonism", he noted, referring to Socrates in Plato's interpretation, that "if we make a person's pleasure the supreme criterion of his actions, then there disappears not only the concept of moral and immoral, but even the concept of smart and stupid in relation to human actions about worthy and unworthy" [2, p. 491]. After much reasoning, K.D. Ushinskii came to the conclusion that a person's enjoyment and his/her happiness should not interfere with the happiness of other people surrounding him/her in society, while socially useful work based on a person's abilities for different types of activities gives a person true and long-term enjoyment.

Conclusions

1. K.D. Ushinskii's philosophical views have evolved from objective idealism to incomplete materialism throughout his life. The commitment to follow empirical scientific data inclined him to dualism, which characterized his "independence in thought and noble courage in character", since dualism was subjected to harsh criticism from both materialism and idealism at that time. K.D. Ushinskii was dissatisfied with idealistic teachings prevailed in the middle of the 19th century and vulgar materialism widespread at that time. The analysis of Ushinskii's creative path shows his disposition to dialectical materialism.

2. Religiosity of education and upbringing, as an element of the pedagogical system of K.D. Ushinskii, also underwent certain evolution. If initially K.D. Ushinskii believed that religion (and above all law) should be at the center of education and upbringing, then in his recent works he considered religion as an applied educational aspect that helps to better master folk culture,

without which no national education is possible.

3. The third fundamental element of K.D. Ushinskii's pedagogical system (scientificity) also changed throughout his life. Two important aspects can be distinguished in this element: the scientific character of pedagogy itself, based on knowledge of anthropology and other sciences, and scientific character as the formation of a scientific picture of the world, acquisition of knowledge of natural and social sciences, which allow students to master professions that meet their interests and needs of the society in a given period of time. According to K.D. Ushinskii, school should prepare students for real life in society and socially useful work activities.

4. Considering a complex concept "world-view" in terms of its three components known in philosophy, such as attitude to life (emotional-psychological side), perception of the world (image of the world in visual sensory representations obtained as a result of sensory perception of the surrounding world) and philosophy of life (cognitive-intellectual side of the world-view), we can conclude that three cornerstones of K.D. Ushinskii's pedagogical system (nationality, religiosity and scientificity) make it possible to form all these components of the world-view. Thus, religion helps form an attitude to the world, nationality – perception of the world, and scientificity forms an idea of the world, nature and society on the basis of their rational explanation.

5. Nowadays K.D. Ushinskii's teachings, particularly ideas of nationality and reliance on Orthodox spiritual values, are relevant in conditions of a course towards globalization of education taken in the 1990s and a certain reverence for Western models of education. Only recently, we have begun to realize that the domestic system of education and upbringing is in some ways better than the Western one. Various sanctions imposed by Western countries have led to rejection of the Bologna Process and modification of the Unified State Exam system and other elements of Western education that are alien our culture and mentality.

6. Relying on such an aspect of K.D. Ushinskii's worldview as the variability and development of nature and society, which presupposes constant correction of education and upbringing in accordance with these changes, it is nec-

essary to abandon dogmas and once and for all established standards of education and upbringing, adapting the education system to new realities of public genesis. Speaking about the possibility of constructing "a complete and perfect theory of education", K.D. Ushinskii himself was well aware of the failure of this plan, since the sciences on which education should be based are still far from perfect. Therefore, the theory of education, following the development of sciences, should also change and improve.

7. If we look at the domestic modern education system from the standpoint of nationality as the main element of K.D. Ushinskii's pedagogical system, we can be unpleasantly struck by the changes that have occurred in it over the past 30 years of copying Western images and values of Western culture. Therefore, it is necessary to radically change the domestic system of education and upbringing in the direction of nationality and Russian identity. These changes should affect, in our opinion, not only secondary and higher schools, but also activities of the mass media and communication, cultural institutions. It should finally be realized that we, as representatives of a great Eurasian country, should develop our own distinctive culture, which is more suitable for our society.

8. This does not mean that both in the system of education and upbringing we should close ourselves off and isolate ourselves from everything progressive that is developed in other countries, including Western ones, especially in the field of pedagogical technologies. K.D. Ushinskii himself called for dialectical thoughtful borrowing of foreign experience, adapting it to Russian conditions.

9. In the first and second volumes of his work "Man as a subject of education", K.D. Ushinskii declared his intention to present in the third volume a set of pedagogical rules based on scientific data of human physiology, psychology, and to consider the relationship of political science, sociology, social philosophy and logic with pedagogy as a science and art. To our great regret, an early death at the age of 47 (the heyday for a scientist, especially a humanitarian) did not allow these intentions to come true. Therefore, teachers themselves have to draw conclusions from his fundamental work and remember at the same time that K.D. Ushinskii himself considered pedagogy both as a science and

as an art. This means that, as an art, pedagogy requires, in addition to knowledge, pedagogical abilities and inclinations. But these abilities and inclinations should be backed with the data of many anthropological sciences. Then the task of the teacher will be to competently and

dialectically use the data of these sciences and specific technologies developed on their basis, in the noble activity of educating such a person who is in demand by modern society, can apply his/her natural talents and abilities for the benefit of this society.

REFERENCES

1. Ushinskii K.D. Man as a subject of education. Experience of pedagogical anthropology. Volume 1. In: Ushinskii K.D. *Sobr. soch. v 11 tomakh. T.8* [Collected works in 11 volumes. Volume 8]. Moscow, Leningrad, 1950, 774 p. (In Russ.).
2. Ushinskii K.D. Man as a subject of education. Experience of pedagogical anthropology. Volume 2. In: Ushinskii K.D. *Sobr. soch. v 11 tomakh. T. 9* [Collected works in 11 volumes. Volume 9]. Moscow, 1950, 627 p. (In Russ.).
3. Rollan R. Renan's words to a teenager. In: R. Rollan. *Sobr. soch. v 14 t. T. 14* [Collected works in 14 volumes. Volume 14]. Moscow, 1958. 832 p.
4. *Filosofskaya entsiklopediya: v 5 t. T. 3* [Philosophical encyclopedia: in 5 volumes. Volume 3]. Ed. by Konstantinov F.V. Moscow, 1962, 584 p.
5. Piaget J. *Psikhologiya intellekta* [Psychology of Intelligence]. Saint Petersburg, 2004. 192 p.
6. Pavlov I.P. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [Complete works]. Moscow, 1951–1954.
7. Frolov Yu.P. *I.P. Pavlov i ego uchenie ob uslovnykh refleksakh* [I.P. Pavlov and his doctrine of conditioned reflexes]. Moscow, 2016. 268 p.
8. Ushinskii K.D. *Pedagogika. Izbrannye raboty* [Pedagogy. Selected works]. Moscow, 2023. 258 p.
9. Ushinskii K.D. *Detskii mir: iz russkoi istorii: in 2 ch. Ch. I.* [Child world: from Russian history: in 2 parts. Part I]. Ekaterinburg, 2023. 304 p.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS

VALERII N. KAZANTSEV – Candidate of Sciences (Philosophy), Associate Professor, Honored Worker of the Higher School of the Russian Federation, associate professor at the Department of Social Psychology, Social Work and Probation of the Academy of the FPS of Russia, Ryazan, Russia, v.cazantsev2010@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-002-3016-0414>

NINA A. TYUGAEVA – Doctor of Sciences (Pedagogy), Professor, Honored Worker of the Higher School of the Russian Federation, professor at the Department of Legal Psychology and Pedagogy of the Academy of the FPS of Russia, Ryazan, Russia, upip2009@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-002-3016-0414>

Received April 8, 2023