

UDC 371.5

DOI: 10.23951/2782-2575-2025-4-26-42

## FOUNDATIONS OF PEDAGOGY: DISCIPLINE OR SCHOOL ETHOS?

*Alexander M. Medvedev<sup>1</sup>, Irina V. Zhulanova<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>1,2</sup> *Moscow City University, Moscow, Russian Federation*

<sup>1</sup> *al.medvedeff2009@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7908-8650>*

<sup>2</sup> *irina.julanova2010@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2309-1865>*

**Abstract.** This article examines a long-standing tension in the history of pedagogy arising from two competing conceptions of education and its organization: mechanistic and humanistic. The familiar opposition between natural-scientific and humanistic paradigms is revisited to encourage reflection on the legacy of classical didactics. We analyze the historical conditions under which didactics emerged, when scientific explanation relied on mechanics and mathematics. These mathematical and mechanistic modes of understanding shaped J. Comenius's design of a didactic system. From the broader rationalist tradition, we highlight G. Leibniz as an emblematic case of the claim that a mathematical calculus can organize reality. The resulting "mechanical order" and numeration informed the structuring of time and space in schools and underpinned school discipline. A synoptic account of disciplinary education is provided with reference to M. Foucault.

The contrast between disciplinary pedagogy and humanistic pedagogy is framed as "mechanism vs. organism," "mechanical aggregate vs. organic system," drawing on arguments by the Russian philosopher and psychologist A. Arsenyev. We then consider school designs that treat the school as an organic system, using the cases of Moscow Experimental School No. 91 and the Univers School in Krasnoyarsk. To explain how education is organized in these schools, we use A. Tubelsky's concept of the school's *uklad* – rendered here as school ethos – and relates it to what English-language scholarship terms the hidden curriculum, that is, the formative influence of the school environment and informal life on students' worldviews.

The article concludes with a description of the project by I. Frumin and B. Elkonin implemented at Univers, titled the "School of Growing Up." Its core idea is to differentiate age-bound and all-age spaces within the school. Age-bounded space is organized around staged growing up; age features are reflected in the regulation of classes and in the architecture and design of learning spaces. All-age space is a shared arena for inter-age communication and encounter.

**Keywords:** *didactics; discipline; determinism; mechanism; organism; freedom; school ethos (uklad); hidden curriculum; personhood*

**For citation:** Medvedev A.M., Zhulanova I.V. Foundations of pedagogy: discipline or school ethos? *Education & Pedagogy Journal*, 2025, vol. 4 (15), pp. 26–42. doi: 10.23951/2782-2575-2025-4-26-42

### Introduction

We begin by formulating the core contradiction that defines the problem field addressed below. This tension is not new; its discussion

and proposed resolutions have a long history in European philosophy, ethics, psychology, and pedagogy. In brief, it is the contradiction between a utilitarian–instrumental view of the human being, where a person is evaluated by certificates, diplomas, standards, regulations, and similar measures, and a value-humanistic view of the human being as a unique individual.

In one way or another, this contradiction is always “resolved” in educational practice, yet it becomes especially acute during periods of education reform, when reorganizations and modernization objectively intensify it. Practitioners repeatedly face the need to choose which pole to prioritize: what to make the aim and value, and what to treat merely as a means or a condition.

Formal, declarative attempts to “remove” this contradiction – typically by offering reassuring “both-and” formulas – actually reinforce the first, utilitarian approach to education. Proclaimed shifts toward “personalization” or a competence orientation often fail to produce substantive changes in practice. Pupil and teacher workload continues to be measured in hours, and success in learning is still assessed by marks and rankings, rather than by transformations in worldview or demonstrable gains in competence. The “value” of a school subject is still determined by the number of hours allotted to it, which defines its weight in the curriculum and teachers’ labor costs. The declared transition to a competence-based framework is commonly expressed through the triad “know / be able to / master,” which teachers spontaneously associate with the earlier focus on knowledge, skills, and abilities (traditionally ZUN in Russian pedagogy). In practice, such associations tend to replace the competence approach with the familiar knowledge-based one.

This occurs because reducing declared innovations to established routines for reproducing educational situations – and one’s own functioning within them – is cognitively straightforward, guided by habitual benchmarks and performance indicators.

By contrast, nurturing the personal dimension – which presupposes independent choice of worldview orientations – resists rigid regulation and control. As a result, learner- and subject-oriented education largely remains a utopia: it is believed in and desired, but real pathways to its attainment exist only at the level of a project. Such a project is oriented not to what already exists, but to what could be under certain conditions and contingencies; without designing those conditions and the means to sustain them, it is unlikely to take shape. This is a pedagogy of the

possible – an area of psycho-pedagogical risk where outcomes cannot be guaranteed.

We now turn to the cultural-historical preconditions of this contradiction.

### **Didactics as a Product of the Era of Universal Determinism**

In the professional consciousness of many educators, a natural-scientific paradigm, grounded in Laplacian determinism<sup>1</sup>, still predominates. At its core lies the idea of the universality of causal explanation for all phenomena. Even pedagogical systems that claim to be innovative proceed on the assumption that it is possible to design instructional influences that will lead to predictable and controllable results. Tellingly, the term technology – applied initially to procedures for producing non-living artifacts (casting technology, sheet-rolling technology, assembly-line technology) – has entered and become entrenched in pedagogical vocabulary. Alongside technology, the term mechanism is often used when one needs to describe governance of the educational process and the impact of pedagogical interventions; to set out interrelations among elements of the pedagogical system and the order in which an instructional technology is enacted; or to present, in a systemic way, the complex of processes and states of a pedagogical system.

Suppose we recall the pedagogical system of the undeniably outstanding thinker J. Comenius (1592–1670), expounded in *The Great Didactic*. In that case, we find that mechanistic and technological images are used to justify the very foundations of the approach. Comenius formulates a general requirement for didactics: “We should wish instruction to become mechanical, that is, so prescribed and certain that everything taught, learned, and done cannot but succeed – just as in a well-made clock, cart, ship, mill, or any machine constructed for movement” [1, p. 238]. The same machine-like, technological character is the key to establishing general discipline: “A school without discipline is like a mill without water; as soon as the water is diverted the mill stops, and so, if discipline is withdrawn, a school necessarily falls to pieces” [1, p. 258]. Elsewhere, the school is likened to a printing press: “The black ink is the living voice of the teacher, imparting from books the knowledge of things and transferring this knowledge into the minds

---

<sup>1</sup> Pierre-Simon, Marquis de Laplace (1749–1827), – French mathematics, physics And astronomer, believed that an accurate description of a system’s initial state and the forces acting within and upon it allows one to calculate all its subsequent states. The past and present determine the future.

of listeners; the press is school discipline, which arranges and compels all to receive instruction” [1, p. 292].

A. Leontiev characterizes this machine-like nature succinctly: “J.A. Comenius compared the teacher (the educator) to a master craftsman, and the school to a workshop in which a human being is made out of a child. This figurative comparison, unfortunately, in some strands of pedagogy, acquired flesh and blood – a step toward turning pedagogy into a ‘recipe-based’ science and the learning process into a ‘didactic machine.’ This view has survived into our day...” [2, p. 14].

The four volumes of *The Great Didactic* appeared from 1633 to 1638, during the era of European rationalism (17th–18th centuries). The hallmark of scientific thought in that era was the use of mathematical and mechanical models. To understand and to explain meant to render a phenomenon as a mechanism or a mathematical description. This mode of understanding spread to everything: the motion of planets (Copernicus, Kepler, Newton), jurisprudence (G. Leibniz), physiology, and the psychology of human thinking (Locke, Hartley).

From the vast continuum of philosophical and scientific achievements of the time, we focus on one notable theory proposed by G. Leibniz. Leibniz (1646–1716), beyond his contributions to logic, mathematics, mechanics, jurisprudence, and linguistics, is known for aspiring to a single “universal science.” Drawing on advances across branches of mathematics and on theories of systematization and classification, he posited the possibility of a “calculus of everything.” He wrote in the *History of the Idea of a Universal Characteristic*: to each thing there might correspond its own “characteristic number” [3, p. 412], and once such characteristic numbers were established for most concepts, humankind would gain a new organon, one that would strengthen the power of the mind more than optical lenses strengthened the eye [3, p. 416]. Ultimately, disputes would be settled not by rhetoric but by computation: “Let us calculate” [4, p. 497].

Leibniz’s “numeric characterization” is not merely a matter of the history of philosophy; today, we see many applications of this idea – for example, blood-group notation, or genomic description. In educational practice, the same logic appears in alphanumeric labels for school classes and university cohorts, numerical marks characterizing attainment, and the calculation of pupil and student rankings.

A significant step in spreading and consolidating the mechanico-mathematical approach occurred at the end of the period in question – the eighteenth century. M. Foucault interprets this as a shift toward a

universal order and universal disciplinarity across all spheres of life, including education [5, 6]. “In the eighteenth century,” writes Foucault, “rank begins to determine the basic form of the distribution of individuals in the school order... The organization of space by rows is one of the major changes in education... By providing individual places, it became possible to control each person’s simultaneous work. School space began to function as a mechanism of learning, but also of surveillance, hierarchy, and reward” [6, p. 179]. Space took on a tabular, matrix-like form that ordered both the physical and the social place of the individual in the educational megamachine; the same matrix governed seating in the classroom and entries in grade books and transcripts. The same applies to time: “Different chronological sequences, which discipline combines, are parts of the mechanism by which complex time is formed” [6, p. 202]. In effect, “the school became a learning machine in which each pupil, each level, and each moment – properly articulated – are continually exploited in the general process of instruction” [6, p. 223]. As M. Savin notes, from this epoch the school, alongside the prison and the barracks, becomes a key disciplinary mechanism in Western society [7, p. 105].

The limited applicability of causal determinism to living beings in general, and especially to those endowed with psyche, was emphasized by leading Russian physiologists and psychologists – N. Bernstein, A. Ukhtomsky, A. Leontiev, K. Fabri, and P. Galperin. Galperin formulated this limit briefly and aphoristically: thanks to mental representation of a situation, the individual gains the possibility of choice, whereas a billiard ball has none [8, p. 59]. Mechanics predetermines the trajectory of the ball; the behavior of a living being with a psyche is determined not only by the past and by external impacts but also by internal regulation, orientation, and an image of the goal (a picture of the future). A living being endowed with psyche constructs a subjective chronotope, defining its own time and space and situating significant events within it. This is most true of the human being, who possesses a life perspective [9, 10] and a space shaped as one’s “cultural body”<sup>1</sup> [11–13].

Differentiating inorganic systems (which I. Kant called “mechanical aggregates”) and organic systems, A. Arsenyev writes: in inorganic systems, the whole is determined by its parts; the parts exist before the whole, and the whole is constructed from the parts as a structure. In

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “human cultural body” was introduced by K. Marx to denote the cultural and instrumental environment that a person uses in his transformative activity.

organic systems, by contrast, the parts are determined by the whole; the whole exists before the parts, and the parts arise as the whole's self-articulation in the course of development. Functional differentiation of the whole precedes its structural segmentation; corresponding organs are created to carry out the functions. The present state of the system is determined not only, and not so much, by its past as by its future (teleological determination prevails) [14, pp. 86–87].

Indeed, a human being appears in the world already as an organic whole – not (to risk the comparison) as an aggregate assembled on a conveyor from a kit of parts and units. A child comes to school “as a whole,” not as a combination of height and shoe size, memory, attention, and thinking; and the child has expectations and an image of the future. It is no accident that preschoolers play at “school,” imagining what will happen there and how. Following the logic of organic systems, the school itself, as a whole, should be conceived as a living organism.

### **Didacticism vs. Humanism**

Relations with classical didactics – rooted in classical mechanics and the idea of universal order and discipline – would be simpler were it not for their enduring connection with humanism. The historical period known as the age of European rationalism (17th–18th centuries), also called the Enlightenment, is marked by the flourishing of humanism and liberalism (Voltaire, J.-J. Rousseau, D. Diderot).

J. Comenius himself wrote the General Council for the Improvement of Human Affairs, which is permeated with ideas clearly opposed to crude mechanicism. For example: “What, then, is a human being? A living creature endowed with freedom of action, destined to rule over creation and to commune eternally with the Creator. The human is made to be (1) the head of all creation, as a little world; (2) ruler of the visible, as the king's viceroy and God's deputy; (3) a partaker in eternity, standing before its throne” [15]. And further: “A human surpasses animals in three ways – by reason, by speech, and by freedom for action of any kind; but the highest distinction lies in absolute freedom of choice, not bound by necessity to do this rather than that” [15]. This is said by the same thinker who likened the school to a machine and pupils to parts of that mechanism, who affirmed the value of discipline rather than “freedom of action,” much less “absolute freedom of choice.”

G. Leibniz, also concerned for the common good, authored a work with the curious title Wilhelm Pacidius Leibniz's Aurora, or the Beginnings of a

Universal Science Emanating from the Divine Light for the Benefit of Human Happiness [16, pp. 401–403]. He also reflects on freedom as a basic property of the rational being: “A human is free insofar as he possesses the power to think or not to think, to move or not to move, in accordance with the preference or choice of his own mind” [17, p. 174].

A path to reconciling two seemingly incompatible positions was found by I. Kant (1724–1804). In the *Critique of Pure Reason*, he formulates two laws of human existence: “The pragmatic law is based on empirical principles, for without the aid of experience I cannot know either my inclinations, which demand satisfaction, or the natural means capable of satisfying them. The moral law abstracts from inclinations and from natural means of satisfying them, and considers only the freedom of a rational being as such...” [18, p. 472]. For Kant, human beings are transboundary creatures living at the boundary of two worlds: the natural world of Laplacian determinism and the world of free rational beings governed solely by the moral law. As entities of the phenomenal world, they are subject to natural and social rules and regulations; as entities of the noumenal world, they possess inner freedom. As empirical individuals, they can be “counted,” given numerical characteristics; as free rational beings, they are incalculable and boundless.

Applied to schooling (and higher education), this duality means that the learner, as a social individual, is embedded in the regulations of the educational process. At the same time, the same person, as a personality, is free to choose worldview anchors. This duality is articulated with particular clarity in the works of A. Arsenyev, V. Bibler, V. Slobodchikov, and E. Yamburg.

The problem-situation we present – discipline or freedom – is perceived differently by educators, philosophers, and psychologists engaged in searching for and justifying new approaches to education. Its sharpness may be downplayed (sometimes the very existence of the problem is ignored), registered as a given, or treated as a challenge and a reason for reflection and active transformation.

As evidence, consider two statements by authors who have long been involved in educational innovation. “By a didactic conception, I mean a system of regulatives in accordance with which the process of teaching is designed and carried out. These regulatives are intended to impart definite goal-related, content-related, and process-related properties to teaching, so that it can fulfill the social function expected of it – forming a person with a particular type of education. This does not contradict the fact that, at a certain stage of democratization, a person is freed from the

rigid fetters of the so-called ‘social demand’ and can choose the type, form, ideological, national-cultural, and professional orientation of their education. Freedom of education would hardly be possible if it ran counter to the requirements of social development” [19, pp. 73–74].

From this standpoint, the problem disappears. However, the introduction of tightly regulated educational standards and unified requirements demonstrates that liberation from the “fetters of the social” – more precisely, state demand is not in sight. Every state, always and everywhere, is interested in reproducing its citizens’ cultural identity, which guarantees its sovereignty. It is difficult to imagine a person’s free choice of ideological and national-cultural orientation without risking the loss of civic identity. The very existence of the state, the country, and the individual as a citizen is defined by unity of views on key issues and a shared understanding of existential choice. E. Yamburg aptly characterizes the problem of freedom and obligation with the metaphor of a shoulder-yoke: what is needed is equilibrium [20].

“A person, to develop as a personality, must have himself as the goal. However, this cannot be done without transforming the social conditions of one’s existence... Such a formulation already shows that the aims of the pedagogical process are sufficiently contradictory. Should we educate a person as a personality or as labor power, as a cultural-historical subject or as a specialist-professional? ... In reality, these aims are objectively antinomic, i.e., their opposition does not depend on the wishes of educators” [21, p. 42].

It is an antinomy precisely because, regardless of the wishes of participants in the educational process – teachers and learners alike – it will be objectively present in their lives. A university applicant has a certain freedom of choice, but school exam scores causally determine it. A graduate has a certain freedom, but the labor market conditions it. Meanwhile, both teacher and student have their own personalities and typically intend to reinforce that conviction. The question is what they understand by personality. This leads to the question of freedom, whose answer is likewise antinomic: freedom from or freedom for (K. Marx, E. Fromm, E. Il’enkov).

V. Bibler proposes relieving the categorical opposition between the social and the personal in education. “The process of upbringing (the scheme educator–pupil), in my view, should in school be projected into the scheme teacher–student. The teacher educates only insofar as he teaches, participates in the work of education. I do not know who the true educator is – the 10–12-year-old schoolchild or the 28- or 40-year-

old teacher who has made many compromises in life. Does the teacher know more? – Yes! But to assume that he is the more normal human being in the moral sense – I think not” [22, p. 11]. And further: “By embedding our knowledge in the pupil’s consciousness, we deal with a certain unpredictable result. But when the school claims to encompass all of the pupil’s free time, to reveal his soul, to know what he is at any time of day, and when we, teachers, are to influence all this, then the school becomes incredibly dangerous... The school should not, through expansion, swallow the entirety of the pupil’s life” [22, p. 12].

V. Bibler argued that developed thinking, enriched by cultural models of relating to the world, forms the basis for proper moral choice. Several arguments support this position. In philosophy and psychology, there is an authoritative view (S. Rubinstein, E. Il’enkov, A. Petrovskii, A. Arsenyev) that the criterion of a mature personality is action based on free moral choice. This stance continues the position of I. Kant [18]. While the development of specific mental functions can be measured by tests, provoking a person to make a moral choice is itself immoral. Thinking can be developed and assessed through problem-solving, tests, and success in contests and olympiads; morality cannot. “Morality is ... an eternal problem. In what sense? Not that we have not found it, but that whatever has been found comes alive each time, because it is concrete. Is there anything moral once and for all, in the sense of a rule? – Only the paradigm of a dead person’s or a hero’s life. That is eternal... But to know once and for all how to act rightly, so that each time our action would follow from some rules – this will not work. There are no rules for all cases of life ... It is eternal in the sense that it is always decided and enacted anew” [23, p. 50].

This issue was debated in the 1980s and 1990s, when discussions about renewing education took place not only in staff rooms but also in academic circles. “An urgent task is to draw on the largely untapped potential of Soviet pedagogical science. This concerns, first and foremost, pedagogical psychology, which, since the second half of the 1950s, has assumed many functions of pedagogical anthropology – the foundational discipline in the system of pedagogical knowledge. All the more or less significant theories of teaching and upbringing from the 1970s and 1980s that have aroused keen interest among teachers are associated with the names of psychologists. Psychology has formed several serious scientific schools and has set forth several conceptions that have gained wide recognition, including abroad” [24, p. 14].

### **Developmental Education and the School Ethos (Uklad)**

The second half of the 1950s marked the first articulation of systems of developmental education (*razvivayushchee obuchenie*). These include L. Zankov's system and the Elkonin–Davydov system (D. Elkonin and V. Davydov). In these approaches – especially that of D. Elkonin and V. Davydov – V. Bibler's thesis on the leading role of thinking in pupils' development was, in effect, realized. The intensive development of hypothetico-deductive thinking in the early grades laid the foundation for worldview formation in middle and upper school; this later produced a recognizable cohort of graduates of developmental education. Among alums of Moscow Experimental School No. 91 – the first school to implement the Elkonin–Davydov system – are outstanding mathematicians, programmers, chess players, and artists. In an interview, when B. Elkonin (D. Elkonin's son and successor) was asked whether he could “recognize” a graduate of School 91, he answered that not by outward appearance, but that after a short conversation, the guess would likely be confirmed.

Recollections by the graduates themselves are collected in the memoir volume *In the Heart of 91*. A few impressions: “To say that School 91 made me myself is to say nothing. The best thing that could have happened to me in life is our school. It is not a building. Not lessons. Not people. It is a whole world, and if you were lucky enough to be in it, you are a terrific lucky one” [25]. “I do not remember my first impression, but in general, this school is, so to speak, an informal intellectual. And the pupils were very lively, not ‘chilled by intellect.’ You know, there are intellectuals, and some of them are not very sociable. Here everything was fine – even with the teachers” [25]. “Some teachers managed to teach us ‘through the subject.’ They taught me – taught us – to be free. Thanks to them, I realized that my calling is in creativity” [25].

Irreducibility to intellectualism; transcending through the subject; irreducibility to anything particular, and the primacy of the school as a whole world – this characterizes the atmosphere of school life, the life of a school as an organic system in which “the whole exists before the parts.” Its world, its microcosm, exists before and above the timetable, homework, and other particulars; above all this, one senses its breathing, its atmosphere.

For a school to transform from a mechanism into an organic system, it must oppose mere discipline with something else. K. Ushinsky wrote of the “spirit of the school,” P. Kapterev of the school's “spiritual physiognomy.” In contemporary Russian pedagogy, the word *uklad* has

taken root, mainly owing to A. Tubelsky, who attributed a special place and function to the concept. A reading of A. Tubelsky's writings on the school *uklad* suggest the concept's constitutive function.

A. Tubelsky held that the *uklad* rests on a social compact that yields a school Constitution: "The *uklad* is possible only as an agreement among those who will live in it – provided decisions are made openly, each member of the community can influence decisions concerning the whole school, and the school community and its governance, self-governance, and co-governance can take on a variety of structures" [26, pp. 179–180].

The *uklad* is formed not by the linear sequence of the instructional process, whose regulations are set, but by the school's various parallel lives: the emergence, growth, and dissolution of child and youth subcultures; flashes of spontaneous creativity; the birth of sympathies and antipathies. All this influences worldview orientations just as much as the curriculum-driven instructional process does. The *uklad* brings together several spaces: instructional, play, artistic-creative, and free-communication. Each of these quasi-"organs" has its own internal regulation and its own order of life.

The *uklad* not only constitutes the school from within. If a school claims to be a living organism, it must, like any organism, participate in exchanges and reduce entropy in its surrounding environment. Put non-metaphorically, a school should become an attractive destination for other educational organizations, which presupposes that it is an open, organic system. Thus, presenting itself to the broader public, what B. Elkonin called publication – it also belongs among the school's tasks.

The *uklad* determines the processes known as hidden education. The term was introduced by P. Jackson in *Life in Classrooms* (1968), where formal and informal processes are shown to shape educational success and failure [27]. It was precisely this kind of hidden education that School 91 graduates had in mind when they spoke of teaching "through the subject."

I. Frumin and B. Elkonin proposed a detailed program for transforming a school into an organic system for the Univers School attached to Krasnoyarsk State University. At the foundation of the project lies the principle of polarization and boundary-ness of the entire school space. The poles of the overall educational space are the age-bounded and the all-age spaces.

Life in the age-bounded space is defined by age stratification – by pupils' and classes' belonging to a given educational stage. In this space, we have a school for growing up. School ages are presented to one another. For a younger pupil, the image of a middle-school student

should be visible and attractive: it is a different, more adult life, and this difference should be manifest in the organization of learning, including greater student independence and responsibility. The age-bounded space, presented as a space of growing up, should disrupt the monotony that M. Foucault described.

The chief indicator of age stages is the difference in modes of engagement, which is achieved, among other things, by changing the forms of organizing the educational process: from the class-lesson model, through the laboratory – seminar model, to the lecture – laboratory model. “The difference in organizational forms,” write I. Frumin and B. Elkonin, “must be made visible and materially fixed, first, in the architectural – aesthetic characteristics of assignments and, second, in the differences in the composition and functions of the rooms for work. For the primary school, the main room is the classroom; for the middle school, the laboratory and a seminar room with a round table; for the upper grades, a lecture hall and a library specially arranged for individual study” [28, p. 32].

How the idea of an age-bounded space first arose and how it was implemented is recounted by I. Frumin in an interview for *Vesti obrazovaniya*: “We thought for a long time about how to make the school not only a platform for developmental education but also an interesting place for pupils. Conversations with my mentors (and later colleagues) helped us grasp an important point: the overall problem with school is that, from first to eleventh grade, it operates under the principles of primary school. And this is fundamentally wrong. From then on, we built the school whose basic construction is the age stages. At the time, we were helped greatly by the opening of a new building, to which we moved all of the primary school, while the old building we divided into two blocks: for middle and for upper-school students” [29].

Now to the all-age space of Univers. This space is free of age stratification. It is constructed as an ensemble of clubs “by interest.” Here, child–adult initiatives take form and come to life, with priority given to pupils’ initiative, in the view of I. Frumin and B. Elkonin, “different forms of study and communication must be expressed in the differing material-aesthetic appearance of the rooms for them” [28, p. 32].

### **Conclusion**

We have revisited a familiar opposition – between disciplinary pedagogy and personality-oriented pedagogy – but have focused on what we consider its core: whether the school is conceived as a technological machine or as an organic system, and, accordingly, whether the pupil is

treated as a ‘numbered’ individual or as an autonomous personality. By a ‘numbered’ individual, we mean a learner whose presence is recorded by a register number, whose achievement is reduced to an average mark, and whose place in a school lineup is determined by height. In contrast, as an autonomous personality, the learner is recognized through sympathies and antipathies, motivation, and vision for the future.

Given the state’s legitimate interest and involvement in reproducing the culture and worldview of future citizens, education will always include regulation and standardization – and therefore numeration and technologization. The task, especially today, is to avoid turning qualities such as conscience, morality, and civic commitment into objects of pedagogical technology. These belong to personal stances. A personality, as an organic system – unlike a social individual, a mere functionary, or a ‘cog’ in the social megamachine – is constituted by freedom of choice. A human being, as an organic system, can develop and acquire identity only within an appropriately organized organic educational environment.

How, then, can an established didactic system with its discipline coexist with the development of personality? We argue that coexistence becomes possible when didactics is integrated into the school’s *uklad* – its ethos – and transformed into a space for growing up. In this configuration, disciplinary forms are subordinated to developmental aims, and the school’s organism provides the living environment in which autonomy, responsibility, and worldview can mature.

### References

1. Veškeré Spisy Jana Amosa Komenského. Sv. IV v. Brno, 1913. 324 p. (Russ. ed.: Komenskii Ya.A. *Velikaya didaktika*. T. 1. [Great Didactics. Vol. 1.] Moscow, Gosudarstvennoe Uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatel'stvo Narkomprosa RSFSR Publ., 1939. 318 p.).
2. Leont'ev A.A. Pedagogicheskoe obshchenie. 2-e izd., pererab. i dop. [Pedagogical Communication. 2nd ed., revised and enlarged]. Moscow, Nal'chik, Izd. tsentr “El'-Fa” Publ., 1996. 93 p. (in Russian).
3. Leibniz G.V. Istoriya idei universal'noi kharakteristiki [History of the idea of a universal characteristic]. In: *Sochineniya v chetyrekh tomakh*. T. 3 [Works in four volumes. Vol. 3]. Moscow, Mysl' Publ., 1984. Pp. 412–417 (in Russian).
4. Leibniz G.V. Ob universal'noi nauke, ili filosofskom ischislenii [On Universal Science, or Philosophical Calculus]. In: *Sochineniya v chetyrekh tomakh*. T. 3 [Works in four volumes. Vol. 3]. Moscow, Mysl' Publ., 1984. Pp. 494–500 (in Russian).
5. Foucault M. Naissance de la clinique: une archéologie du regard médical. Presses universitaires de France, Paris, 1963, 398 p. (Russ. ed.: Fuko M. *Rozhdenie kliniki: Arkheologiya vrachebnogo vzglyada* [The Birth of a Clinic: Archaeology from a Medical Perspective]. Moscow, Logos Publ., 1998. 422 p.).
6. Foucault M. Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison. Edition GALIMARD 1975, Paris, 398 p. (Russ. ed.: Fuko M. *Nadzirat' i nakazyvat'*. *Rozhdenie tyur'my* [Discipline

- and Punish. The Birth of Prison]. Moscow, Muzei sovremennogo iskusstva “Garazh” Publ., 2022. 416 p.).
7. Savin M.V. Istoriko-pedagogicheskie vozzreniya Mishelya Fuko. [Historical and Pedagogical Views of Michel Foucault]. *Istoriko-pedagogicheskii zhurnal – Historical and Pedagogical Journal*. 2012, no 3, pp. 102–14 (in Russian).
  8. Gal’perin P.YA. Vvedenie v psikhologiyu: Uchebnoe posobie dlya vuzov. 2-e izd. [Introduction to Psychology: A Textbook for Universities. 2nd ed.]. Moscow, Knizhnyi dom “Universitet” Publ., 2000. 336 p. (in Russian).
  9. Nuttin J. Motivation, Planning, and Action: a relational Theory of Behavior Dynamics. Leuven University Press; Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Leuven, 1984. Future Time Perspective and Motivation. Leuven University Press; Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Leuven, 1985. (Russ. ed.: Nyutten Zh. *Motivatsiya, deistvie i perspektiva budushchego* [Motivation, Action, and future Perspective]. Moscow, Smysl Publ., 2004. 608 p.).
  10. Tolstykh N.N. *Razvitie vremennoi perspektivy lichnosti: kul’turno-istoricheskii podkhod: avtoreferat dissertatsii dok. psikh. nauk* [Development of the temporal perspective of the individual: a cultural-historical approach. Abstract of the dis. doct. of psychol. sci.]. Moscow, 2010. 54 p. (in Russian).
  11. Marks K. Ekonomicheskoe-filosofskie rukopisi 1844 goda [Economic and philosophical manuscripts of 1844]. In: K. Marks i F. Engel’s. *Sochineniya. Izdanie vtoroe. T. 42* [K. Marx and F. Engels. Works. Second edition. V. 42]. Moscow, Izdatel’stvo politicheskoi literatury Publ., 1974. Pp. 41–51 (in Russian).
  12. Il’enkov E.V. V kakom prostranstve sushchestvuet lichnost’? [In what space does the personality exist?]. In: *S chego nachinaetsya lichnost’* [Where does the Personality begin]. Moscow, Politizdat Publ., 1984. Pp. 344–358 (in Russian).
  13. Nartova-Bochaver S. K. *Psikhologicheskoe prostranstvo lichnosti* [Psychological space of Personality]. Moscow, Prometei Publ., 2005. 312 p. (in Russian).
  14. Arsen’ev A.S. Logika organicheskikh sistem i psikhologiya. Filosofskie tezisy s psikhologicheskim kommentariem [Logic of organic systems and psychology. Philosophical theses with psychological commentary]. *Razvitie lichnosti – Development of personality*. 2013. no 2, pp. 84– 09 (in Russian).
  15. Komenskii Ya.A. *Vseobshchii sovet ob ispravlenii del chelovecheskikh* [General Council on the Correction of Human Affairs]. URL: <https://roerich-lib.ru/komenskij/6577-vseobshchij-sovet-ob-ispravlenii-del-chelovecheskikh?ysclid=mcvrv1eusz681022439> (accessed 16 July 2025) (in Russian).
  16. Leibniz G.V. Vil’gel’ma Patsidiya Leibniza Avrora, ili nachala vseobshchei nauki, iskhodyashchie ot Bozhestvennogo sveta na blago chelovecheskogo schast’ya [Wilhelm Pacidius Leibniz Aurora, or the principles of universal science emanating from the Divine light for the benefit of human happiness]. In: *Sochineniya v chetyrekh tomakh. T. 3* [Works in four volumes. Vol. 3]. Moscow, Mysl’, 1984. Pp. 401–403 (in Russian).
  17. Leibnits V.G. Novye opyty o chelovecheskom razumenii avtora sistemy predustanovlennoi garmonii [New experiments on human understanding by the author of the system of pre-established harmony]. In: *Sochineniya v 4 t. T.2.* [Works in 4 volumes. Vol. 2]. Moscow, Mysl’ Publ., 1983. Pp. 49–547 (in Russian).
  18. Kant I. *Kritika chistogo razuma* [Critique of pure reason]. Transl. from German by N. Lossky. Moscow, Mysl’ Publ., 1994. 592 p. (in Russian).
  19. Serikov V.V. *Lichnostnyi podkhod v obrazovanii: kontseptsiya i tekhnologii* [Personal approach in education: concept and technology]. Volgograd, Peremena Publ., 1994. 152 p. (in Russian).

20. Yamburg E.A. Sovremennyyi vzglyad na vechnye problemy vospitaniya v kontekste pedagogicheskogo opyta XX veka [Modern view on the eternal problems of education in the context of the pedagogical experience of the XX century]. In: *Izuchenie pedagogicheskoy real'nosti v kontekste kontseptsiy istoricheskogo i prakticheskogo proshlogo* [Studying pedagogical reality in the context of concepts of historical and practical past]. Moscow, KURO Publ., 2025. Pp. 272–279 (in Russian).
21. Arsenyev A.S. Problema tseli v vospitanii i obrazovanii [The problem of the goal in upbringing and education]. In: *Filosofsko-psikhologicheskie problemy razvitiya obrazovaniya* [Philosophical and psychological problems of education development]. Moscow, INTOR Publ., 1994. Pp. 35–49 (in Russian).
22. Bibler V.S. Dialog kul'tur i shkola XXI veka [Dialogue of cultures and school of the 21st century]. In: *Shkola dialoga kul'tur: Idei. Opyt. Problemy* [School of dialogue of cultures: Ideas. Experience. Problems]. Kemerovo, "ALEF" Gumanitarnyi tsentr Publ., 1993. Pp. 3–22 (in Russian).
23. Mamardashvili M.K. *Neobkhodimost' sebya. Lektsii. Stat'i. Filosofskie zametki* [The Necessity of Oneself. Lectures. Articles. Philosophical Notes]. Moscow, Labirint Publ., 1996. 432 p. (in Russian).
24. Petrovskii A.V., Slobodchikov V.I., Bim-Bad B.M., Gromyko Yu.V. Zadachi i napravleniya perestroiki pedagogicheskoi nauki [Tasks and Directions of Restructuring Pedagogical Science]. *Voprosy psikhologii – Questions of Psychology*. 1989, no. 2, pp. 14–19 (in Russian).
25. *V serdtse 91* [In the Heart 91]. URL: <https://www.calameo.com/read/00541115421df6767340b> (accessed 20 July 2025) (in Russian).
26. Tubel'skii A.N. Uklad shkol'noi zhizni – skrytoe soderzhanie obrazovaniya [The Way of School Life – the Hidden Content of Education]. *Voprosy obrazovaniya*, 2007, no. 4, pp. 177–181 (in Russian).
27. Jackson F. *Life in the Classroom*, Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY, 1968 (Russ. ed.: Dzhekson F. *Zhizn' v klasse in the Classroom*. Moscow, Izd. dom Vysshei shkoly ekonomiki Publ., 2016. 248 p.).
28. Frumin I.D., El'konin B.D. Obrazovatel'noe prostranstvo kak prostranstvo razvitiya ("shkola vzrosleniya") [Educational Space as a Development Space ("School of Growing Up")]. *Voprosy psikhologii – Questions of Psychology*. 1992, no. 1, pp. 24–33 (in Russian).
29. Frumin I.D. Univers – shkola vzrosleniya [Universe – School of Growing Up]. *Vesti obrazovaniya*. 22.08.2018. URL: [https://vogazeta.ru/articles/2018/8/22/quality\\_of\\_education/4366-univers\\_shkola\\_vzrosleniya?ysclid=mdbdrbxhmu20487778](https://vogazeta.ru/articles/2018/8/22/quality_of_education/4366-univers_shkola_vzrosleniya?ysclid=mdbdrbxhmu20487778) (accessed 20 July 2025) (in Russian).

**Information about the authors:**

**Alexander M. Medvedev**, Candidat of Psychology Sciences, Moscow City University (4, 2nd Sel'skokhozyaystvennyy proyезд, Moscow, Russian Federation, 129226).  
E-mail: [al.medvedeff2009@yandex.ru](mailto:al.medvedeff2009@yandex.ru)  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7908-8650>; SPIN RINTS: 3878-1895;  
Scopus ID: 36802216800

**Irina V. Zhulanova**, Candidat of Psychology Sciences, Moscow City University (4, 2nd Sel'skokhozyaystvennyy proyезд, Moscow, Russian Federation, 129226).  
E-mail: [irina.julanova2010@yandex.ru](mailto:irina.julanova2010@yandex.ru)  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2309-1865>; SPIN RINTS: 5158-2526

## ОСНОВЫ ПЕДАГОГИКИ: ДИСЦИПЛИНА ИЛИ УКЛАД?

**Медведев Александр Михайлович<sup>1</sup>,  
Жуланова Ирина Викторовна<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup> *Московский городской педагогический университет, Москва, Россия*

<sup>1</sup> *al.medvedeff2009@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7908-8650>*

<sup>2</sup> *irina.julanova2010@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2309-1865>*

**Аннотация.** Рассматривается одна из ключевых проблем, сложившихся в истории педагогики под влиянием двух концепций образования и способов его организации. Это механистический и гуманистический подходы. Противопоставление естественнонаучной парадигмы и гуманитарной парадигмы для педагогики не ново. В данном случае актуальность обращения к проблеме определяется необходимостью рефлексии отношения к наследию классической дидактики.

Анализируются исторические условия возникновения дидактики, когда научное объяснение опиралось на достижения механики и математики. Именно математические и механистические способы понимания мира и его законов предопределили подход Я.А. Коменского к построению дидактической системы. Из всего наследия философии рационализма мы выбрали научные построения В.Г. Лейбница. Это яркий образец претензии математического подхода к пониманию всего мироустройства. Механическое устройство и числовой порядок легли в основу организации времени и пространства в школе, в основу школьной дисциплины. Обобщенная характеристика дисциплинарной системы образования дана с привлечением работ М. Фуко.

Различия дисциплинарной педагогики и гуманистической педагогики представлено противопоставлением «механизм – организм», «механический агрегат – органическая система». Для объяснения этого противопоставления использована аргументация, данная российским философом и психологом А.С. Арсеньевым.

Проекты школы как органической системы рассмотрены на примерах экспериментальной школы № 91 г. Москвы и школы «Универс» г. Красноярска. Для понимания особенностей организации образования в этих школах использовано понятие «уклад», введенное основателем «Школы самоопределения» А.Н. Тубельским. Уклад школы ассоциируется с теми феноменами, которые определяются как «скрытое образование» – это влияние среды школы, ее неформальной жизни на становление мировоззрения ее учеников.

В завершение приведено описание проекта И.Д. Фрумина и Б.Д. Эльконина, реализованного в школе «Универс» и названного «Школой взросления». Основная идея проекта состоит в разграничении возрастного и невозрастного пространств школы. Возрастное пространство строится в соответствии с идеей взросления, особенности возраста отражены в регламентации занятий, в архитектуре и дизайне учебных помещений. Невозрастное пространство это пространство общения всех возрастов, место их встречи.

**Ключевые слова:** дидактика, дисциплина, детерминизм, механизм, организм, свобода, уклад, личность

**Для цитирования:** Medvedev A.M., Zhulanova I.V. Foundations of pedagogy: discipline or school ethos? // Education & Pedagogy Journal. 2025. Issue 4 (15). P. 26–42. doi: 10.23951/2782-2575-2025-4-26-42

***Информация об авторах:***

**Медведев Александр Михайлович**, кандидат психологических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Лаборатории проектирования деятельности содержания образования, Московский городской педагогический университет (2-й Сельскохозяйственный проезд, 4, Москва, Россия, 129226).

E-mail: al.medvedeff2009@yandex.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7908-8650>; SPIN РИНЦ: 3878-1895;

Scopus ID: 36802216800

**Жуланова Ирина Викторовна**, кандидат психологических наук, доцент, доцент дирекции образовательных программ, Московский городской педагогический университет (2-й Сельскохозяйственный проезд, 4, Москва, Россия, 129226).

E-mail: irina.julanova2010@yandex.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2309-1865>; SPIN РИНЦ: 5158-2526

*Submitted July 25, 2025*