

Artículo de investigación

The problem of setting educational goals: from Socrates to b. Bloom

El problema de establecer metas educativas: de Sócrates a b. Bloom
El problem of setting educacionales: de Socrates to b. Bloom

Recibido: 20 de abril de 2018. Aceptado: 10 de mayo de 2018

Written by:

Valentina E. Musina⁴²

Andrey P. Peresyarkin⁴³

Galina V. Makotrova⁴⁴

Irina A. Shumakova⁴⁵

Natalia L. Shekhovskaya⁴⁶

Abstract

This article is devoted to the problem of defining educational goals. The authors singled out the methodological foundations of the problem of setting goals in education, describes the key approaches to its solution, shows the essence and logic of the socially conditioned process of changing educational goals in the historical and pedagogical process, outlines the main stages in the development of the problem of setting goals in the field of education. A retrospective analysis of the development of the problem in domestic and foreign pedagogy was carried out. The choice of personalities is due to the role of Socrates and B. Bloom in the development of the problem: Socrates was the first philosopher of antiquity to raise the problem of setting goals as an educational ideal. B. Bloom for the first time in the history of pedagogy has developed "taxonomy of educational goals" as an innovative system for specifying educational goals. The influence of Bloom's taxonomy on the development of education in the world and the course of modern educational reforms in Russia are shown.

Key words: educational goals, the problem of setting educational goals, methodological approaches, research methods, international significance of the "taxonomy of educational goals" Bloom, reform of Russian education.

Resumen

Este artículo está dedicado al problema de definir objetivos educativos. Los autores señalaron los fundamentos metodológicos del problema de establecer metas en la educación, describen los enfoques clave para su solución, muestran la esencia y la lógica del proceso condicionado socialmente de cambiar los objetivos educativos en el proceso histórico y pedagógico, describen las etapas principales en el desarrollo del problema de establecer metas en el campo de la educación. Se realizó un análisis retrospectivo del desarrollo del problema en la pedagogía nacional y extranjera. La elección de las personalidades se debe al papel de Sócrates y B. Bloom en el desarrollo del problema: Sócrates fue el primer filósofo de la antigüedad en plantear el problema de establecer metas como ideal educativo. B. Bloom, por primera vez en la historia de la pedagogía, ha desarrollado la "taxonomía de los objetivos educativos" como un sistema innovador para especificar los objetivos educativos. Se muestra la influencia de la taxonomía de Bloom en el desarrollo de la educación en el mundo y el curso de las reformas educativas modernas en Rusia.

Palabras clave: metas educativas, el problema de establecer metas educativas, enfoques metodológicos, métodos de investigación, importancia internacional de la "taxonomía de los objetivos educativos" Bloom, reforma de la educación rusa.

⁴² Belgorod State University, Russia, 308015, Belgorod, Pobeda St. 85. e-mail: musina@bsu.edu.ru

⁴³ Belgorod State University, Russia, 308015, Belgorod, Pobeda St. 85

⁴⁴ Belgorod State University, Russia, 308015, Belgorod, Pobeda St. 85

⁴⁵ Belgorod State University, Russia, 308015, Belgorod, Pobeda St. 85

⁴⁶ Belgorod State University, Russia, 308015, Belgorod, Pobeda St. 85

Resumo

Este artigo é dedicado ao problema de definir objetivos educativos. Los autores señalar os fundamentos metodológicos do problema de estabelecimento dos metassos na educação, descrevem as enfoques para a solução, muestran a esencia e a lógica do processo de condicionamento social para os objetivos educativos no processo histórico e pedagógico, descrevem as etapas principais o desenvolvimento do problema de estabelecimento de metas no campo da educação. Percebe-se uma análise retrospectiva do desenvolvimento do problema na pedagogia nacional e extranjera. A eleição das personalidades se refere ao papel de Sócrates e B. Bloom no desenvolvimento do problema: Sócrates fue el primer filósofo de the antigüedad en plantear el problema de establecer metas como ideal educativo. B. Bloom, por primera vez na historia da pedagogia, desenhou a taxonomía dos objetivos educativos como um sistema inovador para especificar os objetivos educativos. Se a influência da taxonomia de Bloom no desenvolvimento da educação no mundo e o curso das reformas educativas modernas em Rusia.

Palavras-chave: metas educativas, o problema de estabelecimento de metas educativas, metodologias de investigação, métodos de investigação, importância internacional da "taxonomia dos objetivos educativos" Bloom, reforma da educação

Introduction

Realization of the problem of setting educational goals as a leading trend of the 20th century was remarkably noted by the outstanding Russian teacher A.S. Makarenko back in the 30 years of the XX century: "The goals of our work should be expressed in the real qualities of people who come out of our pedagogical hands." All those whom we brought up are the product of our pedagogical production, and we and society must carefully and carefully examine our product until the last screw "(Makarenko, 1951).

In the second half of the twentieth century, the problem of stating educational goals from different points of view was investigated by G.I. Baturin, V.P. Bepalko, D. Billing, B. Bloom, L. Briggs, R. Gagne, N. Grenlund, K. Deneck, M. V. Clarin, P.W. Kreuzberg, Y.N. Kulyutkin O.E. Lebedev, R. Meyer, B. Nemerko, G. Neuner, K. Rogers, G. S. Suhobskaya, N. F. Talyzina.

In the 1990s, when Russia became part of the "global political and socio-economic changes that began in Eastern Europe in 1989" , a restructuring of the Russian education system was required, which included four stages (Birzea, 1997). The first is correctional (decentralization and deideologization of educational structures); the second - modernization (approaching of educational systems to the western standards), the third - structural (reorganization of structure of school education, re-structuring of a control

system by formation). The fourth system (establishment of control over the quality of education, changing the funding system and the adoption of federal state educational standards (GEF)).

Already at the first stages of the reforms, researchers have revealed new aspects of goal setting problems: the transition from "abstract" goals to "specific" goals at all levels has slowed due to their traditional description in a fairly general form. However, the educational process and training as its leading mechanism can be established only for specific purposes (Clarin, 1997). Despite the great work, the training done and the practical teachers to create a hierarchy of learning goals and their concretization in the context of the implementation of the GEF, there are no systematic scientific studies devoted to the problem of setting goals in both theoretical and practical planets. So far, the scientific context of the mechanisms for setting goals for education has not been clearly delineated, which actualizes the study of the categories of the educational goal and the mechanisms for its formulation.

Analysis of the problem of setting goals in the field of education allowed us to establish a contradiction between the requirements of society for learning outcomes, on the one hand, and the insufficient development of goal setting mechanisms at different levels of education, on

the other. The revealed contradiction served as a basis for determining the problem of our research: what are the historical causes for the development of problems arising in the history of pedagogy, what were the prerequisites for determining the "vitality" of the goal setting problem and what are the possible ways to solve it?

Materials and Theoretical Basis.

At the present stage of social development, the scientific approach to the definition of goals and tasks of human activity becomes more important. The need for clarity and accuracy of goal setting is especially relevant in pedagogical science, where the goal belongs to the central, system-forming categories.

Taking into account the peculiarities of historical and pedagogical knowledge as a "historically developed, constantly evolving and reflecting phenomenon of the phenomenon of human culture", at the beginning of our research key methodological approaches and methods for solving the research problem in the context of the historical and pedagogical process were identified (Bobryshov, 2006). These are: cultural, systemic, axiological, polyparadigmatic, anthropological, civilizational, social-stratification, diversification, hermeneutic approaches.

Sources of research on this problem were the works of scientists of the past - from antiquity to the beginning of the twentieth century; the work of modern philosophers, sociologists, psychologists, teachers on the problem of setting goals for education. To solve the research problem, we used a number of theoretical methods: the method of materialistic dialectics (to determine the essence of the category "goals"); historical pedagogical, historical, contextual, lexical-semantic, historical-genetic and problem-genetic analysis; comparison, conceptualization, periodization, classification. The choice of specific methods of research was determined by the logic of the study and the tasks that must be performed at each individual stage.

Results and discussion.

The analysis of the philosophical category of the goal, conducted by us from the point of view of materialistic philosophy, allowed us to determine its essence and the main reasons for its emergence. According to Marxist philosophy,

the goal as a reflection of a person's need is generated and determined by reality. "Each specific need is generates an interest of the subject to the formation of appropriate goals for satisfying it both in personal and in social aspects "[6, p. 127]. In our opinion, this provision is extremely important for understanding the essence of the goal category in education as a socially conditioned phenomenon reflecting the needs, interests, worldview of a particular person or group of people at a certain stage of socio-cultural development and the embodiment for education of the corresponding educational (educational ideal).

In pedagogical science, the goal rightfully belongs to a number of fundamental scientific categories, and the meaning of the concept of "goal" in education cannot be overemphasized. "Pedagogical goals have a decisive influence on the entire educational process, linking its main components - content, means, methods, organizational forms, control and correction of results - and to a large extent determine the success of pedagogical actions" (Makarov, 1977). An essential feature of the conscious setting of goals in education is its creative character, expressed in the ability of the teacher to improve ways of solving problems depending on new circumstances, to find new ways of solving the set goal, to adjust it depending on its practical implementation. In the process of activity, the achievement of the goal depends not only on the method chosen to achieve them, but also on the intermediate results of the work. They affect all activities, including the objectives themselves, as a tool for clarification and correction. They determine the main and side effects, both foreseen and unforeseen. The result achieved serves as the basis for setting new goals and pedagogical actions that represent the unity of the possible and the real. Thus, in education there is a clear and close relationship between the goal, the means of implementation and the result of the activity. Despite this, understanding the methodological foundations of setting the goals of education and their levels, as well as the psychological and pedagogical foundations of the goal of education, aimed at developing the personality of students and the establishment of public order in the state, this problem is a certain difficulty for practicing teachers. And this despite the fact, that in the field of education it is not new.ЮЮЮЮЮЮЮЮ

Taking as a basis the principle of social determination in determining the goals of

education, we want to note another important feature of setting an educational goal - its creative character. An essential feature of setting the goal as a conscious action (born of human consciousness) is expressed in the ability of the teacher to anticipate, improve ways of solving problems in accordance with new circumstances, to seek fundamentally new ways of solving the set goal, to adjust them subconsciously, focusing on an ideal goal. Therefore mastering theory and practice of setting educational goals is one of the professional tasks and key competences of teachers. The objectives affect all activities, including the objectives themselves, as a tool for clarification and correction. The result achieved earlier serves as the basis for setting new goals for pedagogical actions that represent the unity of the possible and the real. All this requires the teacher not only intellectual, reflexive and prognostic abilities, but also creativity as the ability to create a cultural environment for achieving educational goals.

A profound analysis of the development of the problem of setting educational goals in the history of pedagogy leads us to the conclusion about the continuous struggle of scientists of the past and the present for the right to set an ideal goal of education (a perfect, harmoniously developed personality) with the limitations of this right by possibilities of a socioeconomic system, class and strata (see: T. Mohr, T. Campanella, J. Comenius, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen, and others).

Recognizing that the pragmatic nature of educational goals fully meets the requirements of the time and recognizing the scientific achievements of Bloom and role of the "ladder" of B. Bloom as a way to achievements in teaching, we believe that the creative thought of teachers is able to give an ability to non-technological - humanistic educational goals, which, according to K.D. Ushinsky, capable of awakening in Man a "human".

This is facilitated by the studying of historical and pedagogical heritage in the framework of axiological, anthropological, hermeneutic, humanistic, polyparadigm and other methodological approaches.

Let us turn to a retrospective of this problem. Disputes on the problem of setting goals in the field of education began in Antiquity. The first attempt of history to determine the aims of

education was associated with the experience of the ancient Greek philosophers Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. Ancient thinkers were united in that the goal of education must be the formation of virtues.

Virtue, as Socrates believed, is knowledge or wisdom. Concepts, concepts, representations, true for all, in his opinion, have universal value and significance. The goal of education, Socrates argued, is self-knowledge of man himself as a way of understanding the true good. "Mayevtica" (conversation) and irony were means of self-knowledge. This new method of training was created by the philosopher to help in the birth of truth in the mind of the student. This is a method where students do not passively perceive knowledge, but enter into a live dialogue with the teacher, is relevant today and is the goal - the result of modern education (Beck, 1964). Plato, a disciple of Socrates, considered the main goal of education the development of the higher sides of the soul - the rational and strong-willed; achieving harmony of the three components of the human soul and preparing future perfect citizens through public education. "The education of children is an important task of the state, the legislature can not give it a secondary place," Platon said. The philosopher shared the goals of pedagogical activity on theoretical (knowledge for the sake of knowledge) as facilitating the acquisition of knowledge by students through the study of sciences and practical (for the sake of activity). He taught that "all sciences should be given to children not forcibly, playfully," because "a free person should not study science slavishly." For the proportionality of beauty and health, not only education in the field of sciences and arts is required, but also exercises for physical exercises throughout life. To denote the ideal of education among the Greeks, Plato introduced the term "kalokogatiya" (Ancient Greek - beautiful, kind) - the perfection of the human personality, a harmonious combination of nobility, wealth of physical and spiritual abilities (Losev, 1969).

The ideas of the teacher were developed by Aristotle as a pupil of Plato. Education for Aristotle should be carried out by the state, which determines its purpose, mission and content. The philosopher defined the goal of education as a social function of human education "to create an ideal citizen who can rightly obey or rule" and saw education as a means of strengthening the state. He singled out three

aspects of education: physical, moral and mental, and believed that they constitute a single whole - "the development of the higher sides of the soul - rational and strong-willed, achieving harmony of the three components of the soul." Aristotle also believed that schools should be generally accessible, and all Free citizens should receive education, and care for this upbringing should be a state issue, not a private initiative.

Thus, the ancient thinkers Socrates, Plato and Aristotle were the first in history who realized a comprehensive approach to the consideration of the goal of education. In the spirit of their time, despite differences in philosophical views, they formulated the idea of a comprehensive and harmonious development of the individual, which does not lose its relevance as a goal-ideal. In the Renaissance, progressive humanist philosophers T. Mohr and T. Campanella turned to classical examples of ancient philosophy and once again advanced the idea of the need for a comprehensive and harmonious development of the individual as the goal of education. However, at that time and in subsequent historical periods this idea was not realized in practice, because in the society there were no corresponding socio-economic prerequisites for this. Such prerequisites developed only in the XIX century with the development of machine production (Krasnovsky, 1953; More, Thomas).

A great contribution to the development of the problem of setting the goals of education in the XVII century was made by the distinguished Czech teacher Ya.A. Comenius, who influenced all European education. In his work "Great didactics" he pointed to the main shortcoming of pedagogical activity: the lack of clearly defined goals. According to G.A. Comenius, education should be directed toward the achievement of three goals: self-knowledge and cognition of the surrounding world (mental education), self-government (moral education) and the pursuit of God (religious education) (Campanella, 1954). In connection with the growing social needs, the problem of setting goals for education further stimulated the minds of modern scientists. The English teacher of the 17th century, J. Locke defined the main goal of education as the achievement of "human happiness based on virtue," and argued that a healthy spirit can be cultivated only in a healthy body, which promotes the development of character, moral discipline and physical education. French educators of the XVIII century D. Diderot, Holbach and K. Helvetius also were united in the

idea of the need to establish the social goals of education: the formation of public interests that are combined with the interests of the individual. Thus, K. Helvetius in the book "On the man, his mental abilities and his upbringing" argued that the basis of education should be "the only goal" that can be expressed as a desire for the good of society ... And the teacher's task is to to open their (citizens') hearts to humanity and their minds to truth and, finally, to make them (citizens) ... reasonable and to feel people ... " (Isaiah Berlin, 2002).

Russian Social Democrats, who offered the world their understanding of the goals of education, became teachers of Russian society in the struggle against serfdom and tsarism in the middle of the XIX century. A.I. Herzen was convinced that the goal of education is the preparation of a free, active, humane, comprehensively developed personality struggling with social evil They believed that the goal of education is the preparation of a person of social, ideological, direct and honest with a reasonable share of selfishness, combining "personal" and "social". This socially significant goal is consonant with the ideas of the French Enlightenment. "Father" of Russian pedagogy K.D. Ushinsky wrote in his work "Man as an object of education. The experience of pedagogical anthropology ":" We boldly express the conviction that moral influence is the main task of education, much more important than the development of the mind as a whole, filling our mind with knowledge " (Ushinsky, 1948). The views of these scientists had a serious impact on the course of educational reforms of the second half of the XIX century in setting the goals of Russian education.

The key idea of the nineteenth-century Russian philosopher of education, S.I. Gessen, was goals and values. He wrote: "The goals that we set for ourselves in our activities are dual in nature. Some of them are tasks that provide a complete and final solution. But along with such goals, there are others that are certainly unattainable, which prevents them from being completely solved. No one can say that he has mastered all science, that the task of art, goodness, justice is solved ... ". (Gessen, 1924).

The twentieth century in the history of mankind from the very beginning showed that there are no goals prescribed once and for all, and marked the beginning of a number of outstanding technical inventions and scientific discoveries

that opened the era of continuous scientific and technological progress. A new era has also begun in the history of pedagogy, which was marked by the transformation of science and education into a direct productive force of society and required fundamental changes in national education systems.

Traditional goals and values have been sharply criticized, innovative pedagogical systems, forms and technologies have gained popularity. In accordance with the principles of the historical method, which requires "... to consider the development of theoretical knowledge in pedagogy, taking into account continuity and interrelation with the accumulated data in other scientific schools ...", we analyzed the theoretical prerequisites for changes in education (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). They take their origin in the theory of "activity" training of A. Disterveg (Diesterweg, 1956). In search of a learner-centered learning system, a humanistic approach to the upbringing and education of children was conceived. The well-known "method of projects" was based on the theoretical concept of "pragmatic pedagogy" by D. Dewey, who considered only that which gives practical results and is aimed at the benefit of the whole society is true and valuable. Russian teachers N. V. Chekhov and K.N. Wenzel advocated the method of projects Dewey. This method was officially called "brigade-laboratory" in Soviet Russia in the 1920s, however, in the 1940s it was exhausted because of ambiguous understanding of the goals. American teachers used it as a way to awaken interest in the learning process and wanted the project to bring the child a specific personal benefit and could be used in everyday life. Soviet teachers have developed motives for socially useful work with the project for the benefit of society. Later, Russian scientists L.S. Vygotsky S.L. Rubinshtein A.N. Leontyev P.I. Galperin D.B. Elkonin and V.V. Davydov developed the concept of an "active" approach to learning and theoretically rehabilitated the method of projects. In addition to the pragmatic approach, a humanistic approach takes a significant place in the theory and practice of education (K. Rogers, E. Kelly, A. Maslow, A. Combs). The ideas of the cognitive approach (B. Bloom, D. Kravol, B. Musia, A. Harrow) disseminated widely. Each approach has made a worthy contribution to the development of the problem of setting up educational goals.

Thus, the analysis and synthesis of approaches allowed us not only to comprehend the reasons

for their appearance in education, but also to emphasize the social conditioning of the goal-ideal of education, which is in fact abstract, but sets the direction for the formation of more concrete tactical and operational goals, the general movement of thought in the process of setting goals goes from the abstract to the concrete.

"The specific goal," the philosophers believe, "is that the subject and the methods of its implementation are clear, and therefore they serve as a direct stimulus to activity, have a pronounced practical approach" (Yatsenko, 1977).

Consider the ideas of the most common technology in the world of setting specific educational goals - to the taxonomy of B. Bloom ("taxonomy" is synonymous with "classification"). The "Taxonomy of Educational Purposes: Classification of Educational Purposes" taxonomy, known as the "Bloom Taxonomy" appeared in 1956 and immediately became widely known among American teachers and teachers of other countries. Initially taxonomy was a model for classifying thinking in accordance with six cognitive levels of complexity and included (in ascending order): knowledge, understanding, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation (Bloom & Krathwohl, 1956).

The idea of taxonomy was not used in the practice of Russian education because of the traditional Russian mental concept of the goal of education as an ideal to which one should strive. In addition, the culturological approach that prevailed in Russian education (Lerner, 1991) fully met the needs of education and society and helped students achieve high learning outcomes (knowledge) (Lerner, 1991). Nevertheless, the idea of stating the goals of education from the abstract ideal to the concretized goals of the lower levels (tactical, operational) was of practical interest to scientists in the field of pedagogy and psychology. Russian scientists L.B. Kulyutkin, Y.N. Lyaudis, N.F. Pechenyuk, N.F. Talyzina, based on the idea of Bloom, developed their classifications of educational goals and their levels. At the same time, the idea of specifying goals was formally logically justified by Russian philosophers-materialists M.G. Makarov (1977), A.Yatsenko (1977) and P.P. Bibichom (1987) and provided a methodological basis for pedagogical research. (Bibich, 1987).

In the 1990s, Bloom's former students, L. Anderson, and D. Crathworth updated the taxonomy, hoping to add relevance to pupils and teachers of the 21st century. The revision published in 2001 includes very significant,

changes. Bloom's systematics was developed in two other areas: the affective domain and the psychomotor (see Table 1) (Krathwohl et al, 1964).

Table 1. Taxonomy of Educational Purposes: Classification of Educational Goals

Cognitive Domain Bloom	Affective Domain Krathwohl, Bloom, & Masia	Psychomotor Domain Simpson
<i>Knowledge</i>	<i>Attitude</i>	<i>Skills</i>
1. Knowledge	1. Receiving phenomena	1. Perception 2. Set
2. Comprehension	2. Responding to phenomena	3. Guided response 4. Mechanism
3. Application	3. Valuing	5. Complex response
4. Analysis	4. Organize values into priorities	6. Adaptation
5. Synthesis	5. Internalizing values	7. Origination
6. Evaluation		

As shown in Table 1, the Bloom system has acquired a certain completeness after joining the last two domains. This allowed teachers to broaden their understanding of educational goals by indicating them in accordance with the levels of achievement not only in terms of knowledge, which consists of six levels, but also what is important in the aspect of the relationship, which consists of five levels, and also the psychomotor aspect, reflecting the levels of the formation of practical skills that were formed in the learning process. "Taxonomy is hierarchical - each level falls into higher levels.

For many years Bloom's levels were often portrayed as a ladder, which prompted many teachers to motivate students to "go to the highest level."

Subsequently, in 2001, the students of Bloom developed a new taxonomy, hoping to increase its value to pupils and teachers of the 21st century. The revision includes several seemingly insignificant, but in fact very significant changes - the taxonomy of Bloom has acquired a two-dimensional character (See Table 2.).

Table 2. Two-dimensional Taxonomy of D. Krathwohl and Anderson

The Cognitive Process Dimension						
The Knowledge Dimension	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Factual Knowledge	List	Summarize	Classify	Order	Rank	Combine
Conceptual Knowledge	Describe	Interpret	Experiment	Explain	Assess	Plan
Procedural Knowledge	Tabulate	Predict	Calculate	Differentiate	Conclude	Compose
Meta-Cognitive Knowledge	Appropriate Use	Execute	Construct	Achieve	Action	Actualize

As shown in Table 2, each level of knowledge in accordance with the taxonomy can be correlated with each level of the cognitive process so that the student can memorize both factual and procedural knowledge, understand conceptual and metacognitive knowledge, and analyze metacognitive or factual knowledge. The new version of the taxonomy of educational goals is conceptually linked to the goals of

Russian education in accordance with the Federal State Educational Standards and is used to set goals - which are also determined by three groups of results: personal (values, relationships), subject (knowledge and subject skills), meta-subject (complex intellectual skills, self-regulation, ways of communication).

Conclusion.

In conclusion, we note that the study of the problem of setting educational goals from Socrates to B. Bloom confirmed our hypothesis about the long-term value and relevance of this problem. We came to the conclusion that the goals of education as a forecast of future social development will always be at the center of attention of scientists, teachers and society, despite the conceptual differences. In the full and harmonious development of the individual as the goal - "Ideal", generated by ancient Greek philosophers and developed by other scientists in the history of pedagogy and education, there will always remain a global goal of education. At the same time, we believe that the taxonomy of B. Bloom, like the table of chemical elements of the outstanding Russian chemist DI Mendeleev, will serve as a model for setting and revising the goals of education for future generations of teachers, in accordance with the changing needs of society in different countries, including in Russia, within the framework of a single world educational space.

References

Beck, (1964). Greek education, 450–350 B.C. London: Methuen. 381p. *Journal of Hellenistic Studies*. Volume 3. Published: December 23, 2013, pp. 231-232 [Electronic resource]. Available at: doi.org/10.2307/623538

Bibrich P.P. (1987). *Izuchenie tipov celepolaganiya* [Study of the types of goal-forming]. Chisinau, 131p. (in Russian)

Birzea, C. (1997). The Dilemmas of the reform of Romanian Education: Shock Therapy, the Infusion of Innovation or Cultural Decommunization? *Higher Education in Europe*. Vol. XXII, no. 3. Pp.: 321-327. Higher Education (in Russian) on in Europe, Taylor & Frances. Date Views 02.08.2006
www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0379772970220306

Bloom, B. S. and Krathwohl, D.R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals, by a committee of college and university examiners.*

Handbook 1: Cognitive domain. New York, 207 p.

Bobryshov, S.V. (2006). *Metodologiya istoriko-pedagogicheskogo issledovaniya razvitiya pedagogicheskogo znaniya* [Methodology of historical and pedagogical research of the development of pedagogical knowledge,] M. S. thesis, Stavropol State Univ., Stavropol (in Russian)

Campanella, T. (1954). *City of the Sun*. [Electronic resource]. Available at: <http://www.fcsh.unl.pt/docentes/rmonteiro>

Clarín, M.V. (1997). *Innovacii v obuchenii: metafory i modeli: analiz zarubezhnogo opyta* [Innovations in teaching: metaphors and models: Analysis of foreign experience]. Moskva, Nauka, 223p. ISBN 5-02-013618-2 (in Russian)

Diesterweg, A.F. (1956). *Selected pedagogical compositions*, Moskva, Uchpedgiz, - pp. 136-203. (In Russian)

Federal'nye gosudarstvennye obrazovatel'nye standarty obshchego obrazovaniya. [Federal state educational standards for general education] [Electronic resource]. Available at: minobrnauki.rf/documents/938 (in Russian)

Isaiah Berlin, (2002). "Helvétius" in *Freedom and Its Betrayal: Six Enemies of Liberty*, ed. Henry Hardy, pp. 11–26.

Krasnovsky A.A. (1953). *Jan Amos Comenius*. Moskva, 49p. (In Russian)

Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S., Masia B.B. (1964). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Handbook 2: Affective Domain*. New York, 196 p

Lerner, I. Y. (1991). *Osnovnoe sodержanie obshchego obrazovaniya* [Basic content of general education]. Moscow, Soviet pedagogy. Vol. XI. - pp. 15-21. (in Russian)

Losev, A.F. (1969). *Istoriya drevnej ehstetiki, t. II - Sofisty. Sokrat. Platon* [The History of Ancient Esthetics, vol. II - Sophists. Socrates. Plato]. (1969) 4: Aristotle and Late Classic [Electronic resource]. Available at: dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/ruwiki/79879 (In Russian)

Makarenko, A.S. (1951). *Sochineniya: v 6-ti tomah* [Works: In the 6th volume]. Moscow, Vol.5, p.441. (in Russian)

Makarov, M. G. (1977). *Kategoriya «celi» v marksistskoj filosofii i kritika teleologii*. [The category of the "goal" in marxist philosophy and criticism of teleology]. Leningrad. 154 p. (In Russian)

More, Thomas, «Utopia», trans. John P. Dolan, in James J. Greene and John P. Dolan, ed., *The Essential Thomas More*, New York: New American Library [Electronic resource]. Available at: wikivisually.com/wiki/Utopia

Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Penguin Books.

Ushinsky, K.D. (1948). *Chelovek kak ob"ekt vospitaniya. Opyt pedagogicheskoy antropologii*,

sobrannye proizvedeniya [*Man as an Object of Education, Collected Works*], M., T. 2. 557 p. (in Russian)

Yatsenko, A.I. (1977). *Celeustremlennost' i idealy* [Purposefulness and ideals]. Yatsenko A.I., Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, Institute of Philosophy. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 276p. (in Russian)