

FORMING HONESTY-BASED SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP TO HARMONIZE THE TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONAL DYAD

S. A. KRYLOVA

Doctor of Philosophy, Professor

Head of the Department of Culturology and Philosophical Anthropology

National Pedagogical Dragomanov University

ORCIDiD <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6256-339X>

Abstract. The article analyzes the phenomenon of social partnership in its broad sense. True and formal social partnerships, which correlate with beauty and selfishness in relationships, have been considered. So, true social partnership involves the beauty of relationships between individuals and social groups. Formal relationships imply the use of manipulation that, in the form of populism, covers individual and group selfishness. In this paper, we propose the idea that the beauty of relationships in the educational space is based on the formation of a new methodology, the basis of which are the principles of tolerance and synthesis, which are specified by understanding the essence of the global world.

The beauty of relationships between a teacher and a student has been realized as a recondition and a kind of social partnership. There are several principles of communication between a teacher and a student that we would like to consider. The first one is unfruitful, when a student repeats the ideas of a teacher without developing or completing them with his/her creative findings. The second principle appears to be the opposite of the first one and it is also unfruitful because a student completely rejects the teacher's approach, forgetting about his/her ideas and personality. The third approach rises above the limitations of the first two and entails the beauty of relationships - a student is developing the ideas of a teacher and complementing them with new ideas and concepts.

Gender strategies in education have been considered: masculine-subordinate, feminine-coordinate, androgynous-integral. The first two are evaluated as unfruitful, whereas the third one is seen as fruitful, which becomes the basis for constructing the beauty in the relationship between a teacher and a student.

Keywords: true and formal social partnership, teacher-student relationship, educational strategies, gender construction, androgynous-integral strategies.

INTRODUCTION

The system of social partnership has been more developed in Northern Europe, especially in Scandinavian countries, than in Southern European countries, as well as in the USA.

We can agree with O. Sytnik (2009), who considers, that the updating of the system of social partnership is a condition for establishing social dialogue in society and for overcoming the post-totalitarian status of the state in modern Ukraine.

I. Kiselev (1992) states that solving disputes in labor collectives within the framework of social partnership is possible through negotiations with the aim of reaching compromises.

But in this literature there is practically no view that social partnership includes the interpersonal relationships of people who are able to move from subordination to coordination, and to such coordination, which has socially significant consequences.

Androgynous analysis is the methodological basis of this article, which means the study and in-depth correction of the existence of personality and relationships between individuals in the context of gender, as well as meta-anthropological, comparative, hermeneutical methodology and methodology of synthesis.

The social partnership, in its broad sense, can be defined as interaction of people, whose goals and objectives are embodied in the creative cooperation with each other, aiming to develop society (Krylova, 2011). Today, in Ukrainian society, the need for such a partnership is becoming more and more relevant, because without the organization of the social partnership system, post-totalitarian tendencies in the economy, politics, and the humanitarian sphere can hardly be overcome; moreover, only the development of social partnership can create a real civil democratic society.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Let us consider the social partnership, which can be true, as well as formal. The true social partnership implies the beauty of relations between individuals and social groups, while the formal one is correlated to power manipulation. In the form of populism, the latter covers individual and group selfishness like a mask, where the political and economic "elite" acts for the sake of its pragmatic interests which are detached from the interests of the whole society.

Within contemporary Ukrainian society, the problem of the formal social partnership is fatal, since without its theoretical and practical solution, any democratic changes will only be masking post-totalitarianism. As a consequence, the achievement of social justice will always be undercut by

populism, thus leading to the increase in alienation of the society and provoke indifference or social escalation.

The true social partnership is rooted in the system of education, producing the beauty of the relationship between a teacher and a student, thus influencing both the future and the present state of the society. Therefore, the beauty of relationships in the educational process is the beauty of the relationship between a teacher and a pupil or a student, a supervisor of studies and a postgraduate student, and it is one of the most important aspects of beauty in the social being of a person. Awareness of the possibility and reality of such beauty actualizes the need to address the theoretical and methodological achievements of the philosophy of education, which is actively developing in modern Ukrainian philosophy, in close conjunction with social philosophy. This is the major aim of the Department of Philosophy of Education and Social Philosophy at the National Pedagogical Dragomanov University in Kyiv, Ukraine.

The present study is based on Andrushchenko's theoretical framework and methodology, suggesting the idea of updating communication in the educational process based on the theory and practice of tolerance. "Through its content, tolerance shows educational problems, and, therefore, reveals and emphasizes the task of pedagogical science". And only on the basis of tolerance is it possible to "comprehend new relationships between students and teachers ... educational institutions; fundamental changes in the organization of the educational process; psychological climate in the team; opportunities of innovational activity ... " (Andrushchenko, 2005:16).

Thus, Andrushchenko emphasizes the need for a new methodology of synthesis, which is, in fact, the theoretical correlation of tolerance and can become the basis for the development of democratic values. "The philosophical vision of a new picture of the world," he notes, "is, first of all, ... the domination in being of open rationalism, built on the principles of global evolutionism, the unification of the sciences about nature and the sciences about spirituality, that means, the synthesis of various ways of spiritual and practical comprehension of the world". (Andrushchenko, 2005). The paper builds on this holistic view in sustaining the idea of synthesis of understanding, both from a scientific and a humanistic point of view. Other authors, such as Baehr (2011), include the fostering of intellectual virtues as the essential aim of education. Additionally, Baehr (2016) points to the increasing interactions which are ongoing between social and virtue epistemologists and philosophers of education. Against this background, the beauty of relationships in the educational space is based on the formation of a new methodology, the basis of which are the principles of tolerance and synthesis, which are specified by the understanding of the essence of the global world.

Therefore, the paper proposes not only theoretical models, but the practice of moral communication between a teacher and a student can be generated based on this synthetic framework. It is highly relevant to appeal to the beauty of relationships between a teacher and a student in the context of social partnership. The harmony of relationships between teachers and students is one of the primary elements which make up the beauty of relationships in the world of people and without it the social partnership is impossible. The beauty of the relationship between a teacher and a student, on the one hand, means respect for the teacher, and on the other - the ability to go beyond his/her ideas.

This approach allows us to distinguish several principles of communication between a teacher and a student. The first one is unfruitful, when a student repeats the ideas of a teacher without developing them and without elaborating on them with their creative findings. In this sense, one cannot but agree with the idea that outlines the possibility of ugliness in the relationship between a teacher and a student: "If you stop at the level of a teacher, you will cause him pain" (Khamitov, 2009:165). The second principle appears to be the opposite of the previous one, but it is also unfruitful, when a student completely rejects the teacher's approach, forgetting or ignoring his/her ideas and personality. The third approach rises above the limitations of the first two principles – the student develops the teacher's ideas by adding new ideas and concepts.

To illustrate this case in point, we may resort to the moral education of Plato which is highly esteemed in Western humanities and especially in the philosophy of education, and which is based on harmonious relationships (Lee, 1994). The relationship between Plato and Socrates may be seen as a model sample of the beauty of teacher-student relationships in the Western culture. Plato accepts the ideas of his teacher, making Socrates the main character of his dialogues, and further developing his teachings. The relationship between Socrates and Plato is a striking example of the third principle, as mentioned above. Plato elaborates philosophical texts that express the thoughts of Socrates,

completing them by his own additions. In this context, it is quite right to think: "If communication with the Teacher does not expand your boundaries, this means that you have called the Teacher a wrong one" (Khamitov, 2009:166). In *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Education*, Siegel (2009) also discusses Socratic teaching in relation to caring and empathy in moral education, as well as the cultivation of character and value systems.

In the modern world, the beauty of the relationship between a teacher and a student aims to express openness to the Other and the ability to build a dialogue, above anything else. Dialogism involves not only spiritual but also moral qualities - flexibility, softness, empathy. It is precisely these qualities that make it possible to overcome pride and self-centeredness and hear the Other. But to demonstrate them, you need to be tolerant to the Other: a teacher towards a student, a student towards a teacher. Openness and dialogue are the fundamental features of tolerance, which correspond to the true beauty and integrity of the relationship between a teacher and a student.

In what follows, the paper addresses the gender dimension of the beauty of relations in the educational process. The real social partnership cannot be without gender in the modern society. It is obvious that any educational process requires the beauty of the teacher's relationship with colleagues and students. In this context, the reference to gender education strategies that are primarily implemented through the teacher's personality is extremely relevant nowadays. The masculine or patriarchal strategy of the teacher's personality, which applies subordination in the educational process, has become archetypal. The masculine-subordinate strategy of the teacher has its positive and negative features. Indeed, subordination in education is a prerequisite for effective learning, but it may be considered insufficient. Furthermore, going beyond a certain boundary, such a strategy of building relationships leads to the establishment of authoritarianism and replicates attitudes towards the Other as towards an object.

On the other hand, the coordination educational strategy, which in the context of our study could be called feminine-coordinating, has been increasingly prevalent in feminist studies (Noddings, 1984). This personality trainer's strategy also displays features that are both positive (flexibility, tolerance) and negative (lack of strategic, hardness), being a necessary, but insufficient condition for effective teaching.

The question arises whether we can propose a synthesis of masculine-subordinate and feminine-coordinating education strategies, which would combine all their positive features. Our affirmative view suggests that this synthesis may be envisaged and it can be called *androgynous (androgynous-integral)* or *humanistic*. This strategy involves going beyond the monologism of the educational process into a co-creative dialogue with students as an educational ideal to be achieved (Siegel, 1997). However, as discussed above, such a strategy of education can be fruitful and constructive when the synthesis of masculine-subordinate and feminine-coordinating takes place not only in the educational process, but also in the *world of personality*.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the paper proposes the formation of the androgynous (holistic) personality in the educational process, which refers first of all to the integral person, who harmoniously combines the gender, spiritual, and moral principles. The integrity of the androgynous personality determines her/his creative character, given that the androgynous-integral personality is *a creative personality*. But this personality is directed not solely to creativity, but to *androgynous creativity* – that is the creation of integrity in human beings as beauty of relations and actions, ultimately meaning creation of unity of spiritual and moral principles. True love and self-respect allows the teacher to treat his/her students and colleagues equally. The conclusion reasserts Khamitov's (2009) view that genuine social partnership in the relationships between a teacher and a student is not only an ideal, but also the basis of a fruitful process of upbringing and education.

REFERENCES

- Andrushchenko, V., 2005 – "Philosophy of education of the XXI century: finding priorities". *Philosophy of Education* 1: 16, Ukraine.
- Baehr, J., 2011 – *The Inquiring Mind: On Intellectual Virtues and Virtue Epistemology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Baehr, J. (Ed.), 2016 – *Intellectual Virtues and Education: Essays in Applied Virtue Epistemology*, New York: Routledge.
- Kiselev, I., 1992 – *Labor law in a market economy: the experience of Western countries*, Russia.
- Krylova, S., 2011 – *Human Beauty: Personality, Family, Society (socio-philosophical analysis): monograph*. Nizhyn: Aspect- Polygraph Publishing Ltd: 344, Ukraine.
- Khamitov, N., 2009 – *Aphorisms of power*. Kyiv: Afta: 269, Ukraine.
- Lee, M., 1994 – “Plato's philosophy of education: Its implication for current education”. Proquest Digital Dissertations Retrieved from: <https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations/AAI9517932>.
- Noddings, N., 1984 – *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Siegel, H. (Ed.), 2009 – *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Education*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Siegel, H., 1997 – *Rationality Redeemed?: Further Dialogues on an Educational Ideal*, New York: Routledge.
- Sytnik, O., 2009 – *Social Partnership in Ukraine: Features of Formation and Development Prospects*, Collection Essay of Scientific Works of NKTU № 3, Ukraine.