

Introduction

Modern social rehabilitation thought and pedagogical paradigms of the 20th century*

Pedagogical thinking, and so also involving social rehabilitation educators, is based on specific paradigms understood as a set of general premises in explaining the area of reality, adopted by representatives of the scientific discipline as the model of definitive thinking.

In the twentieth century, several social and pedagogical paradigms emerged, which had the greatest impact on the theoretical base of social rehabilitation pedagogy, and thus also on educational practice.

The structuralist paradigm stems from realism and determinism, thus scientific objectivity and assumes the existence of objective structures through which life progresses. Each individual is assigned to a specific structure and subject to the impacts of objective forces determining his fate. It examines the assumed social conflicts from the point of view of social organizations (structures).

Similarly, the functional paradigm stemming from realism and determinism (scientific objectivity) defines the social world as objective existence with ready structure governing the life of the individual. A form of description of the world is the cultural system conforming the personalities of individuals to it. In a sense,

.....

* This text is an excerpt from the author's book *Pedagogika Resocjalizacyjna. W stronę działań kreujących*, Oficyna Wydawnicza "Impuls", Kraków 2014.

it is a paradigm of social homeostasis acknowledging social inequality as the price of social balance.

The humanistic paradigm, which has its roots in nominalism and voluntarism, and therefore scientific subjectivity, justifies the individual and subjective meaning of social life. It presents a critical position towards culture as a set of facts imposed on a person. According to this trend of thinking, a person has the right to make the rules and have a real impact on culture, as well as interpret social conflicts from the point of view of the protection of an individual's interests.

Similar assumptions are adopted by the interpretative paradigm, which also prefers scientific subjectivity, rejecting (like the humanistic paradigm) deterministic order, dealing with the development of awareness of individuals functioning within social structures. The subject of the interpretative paradigm is subjective understanding of the social experience by testing specific human collectivity.

On the basis of the paradigms two trends of building the pedagogical theory have emerged. The first of them is **pedocentrism**, the goal of which is unrestrained development of a child (humanistic paradigm), preferring conscious radical actions strengthening its development and removing social block of this development (*antipedagogy, pedagogy of postmodernism*), and conscious actions governing and strengthening in the child records of the subjective meanings provided by the surrounding reality (interpretative paradigm – *personalistic pedagogy, pedagogy of religion*).

In opposition to this trend is **didascalioentrism** located in the structuralistic and functional paradigm, and consisting in conscious and radical actions shaping the personality of a child able to act in the conditions of structural conflicts (Herbert's pedagogy, positivist pedagogy) and conscious actions that shape the personality of a child in accordance with the psychological-social standards in force in a given culture.

The effect of the mentioned visions of building pedagogical theory clashing, two fundamental trends of thinking about pedagogy as a theory and social practice are visible. The first is *neopositivist pedagogy*, the second – *pedagogy of culture*.

Neopositivist pedagogy dates back to Herbert's work (1806) of "*educational teaching*", based on psychological determinism (behaviourism) and sociological determinism (Comte, 1961), as well as the teachings of E. Durkheim (1968) (determination of theoretical and practical conditions of relations between an individual and society)

Pedagogy of culture on the other hand acknowledges and prefers developing and educating an individual through his contact with cultural goods. It is adjusted to hermeneutics, that is in-depth interpretations and understanding symbols by recognizing various educational effects (aesthetic, ethical, artistic education) as pedagogical stimulation of the impact of cultural values on the development of the human personality. In a sense it has become a defence of pedagogy against strictly scientific, naturalistic and materialistic orientations.

Undoubtedly these paradigms and pedagogical theories have had a decisive influence on the theoretical and application space of social rehabilitation pedagogy, both the “classic” one and new trends of searching for theoretical justifications of the social rehabilitation process.

It seems that the following lay at the heart of the emergence of *classical social rehabilitation pedagogy: structuralistic and functional paradigm with the theoretical concept of didascalio-centrism*, while the dominant broad theoretical and methodical base was neopositivist pedagogy.

Whereas *modern (new) social rehabilitation pedagogy* dates back to the *pedocentric vision based on the humanistic and interpretative paradigm*. This fundamental difference in the theoretical approach to the problem and resulting in new methodical solutions triggers live controversy and discussions in scientific environments, but especially arouses anxiety and many doubts in environments of educators-practitioners. Therefore, it is also worth taking a closer look at the issue.

The meaning of every social rehabilitation action is the human being, so the subject is his good. It should be understood in a way that is devoid of contextual and interpretative nuances. The good of every human being is his development, which enables him to overcome obstacles in such a way, so that every time he looks back he does not see “a social wall of indifference”, and when he looks forward he sees social perspectives opening up before him. It can be said that these three mentioned objects of reference are linked by socialization culture.

At the source of every socialization culture are values and standards. They give people a sense of meaning and form a set of guidelines of conduct. They are the signs on the roads and wilderness of our lives. The quality of our existence depends on the level of their adoption and skill of proper application. Socialization-cultural conditions accompanying people from birth affect their behaviours, at the same time not denying them individuality and spontaneity (Giddens, 2006).

It is the socialization culture that co-creates the most important parameters of our identity, enabling our personal fulfilment in our social roles. Human individual identity and human social identity determine the essence of understanding both ourselves and other people.(Giddens, 2006). Through the parameters of personal identity we can better understand ourselves, and through the parameters of social identity we are understood by others.

Socialization culture and creative solving of problem situations stemming from it enable to individualize human fate, and equip a person with creative possibilities. Culture, creations, creativity are the primary social determinant of human development and, at the same time, define the main parameters of his individual and social identity. The content of these three concepts builds the inner intellectual space of man and affects his life roles.

The human as creator and the human as a result of creation. These two dimensions of human vision and vision of the world are tied into the history of

human culture and civilization. Over the long ages of human development these dimensions displayed a variety of indirect forms of our creations contained in philosophical and cultural ideas. However, regardless of whether the theocentric, anthropocentric or reicentric perspective was adopted, people have always had unwavering faith that their human existence is not a work of chance. They exist for some Purpose, created or constructed, with a Soul or without one. Human life has many dimensions. One of the most important seems to be the dimension of human creation by human.

Searches for theoretical contexts, which are the foundation of considerations relating to *contemporary (new) social rehabilitation pedagogy*, are defined as part of broader and different concepts than the traditional criminological, legal-penal concepts, psychological behavioural and psychodynamic theories.

Therefore, we can conclude that the theoretical reflection concerning contemporary social rehabilitation and consequent methodical contexts can be found in the cognitive space and interactionistic vision of a human being and society, as well as cultural pedagogy, and especially in its modern emanation, which is *psychology and pedagogy of creativity*, as well as in pedagogical and psychological theories dealing with heuristics.

Professor Marek Konopczyński, PhD

Literature

- [1] Comte A., *Metoda pozytywna w szesnastu wykładach (The Positive Method in Sixteen Lectures)*, Warsaw 1961.
- [2] Durheim E., *Zasady metody socjologicznej (The Rules of Sociological Method)*, Warsaw 1968.
- [3] Giddens A., *Socjologia (Sociology)*, Warsaw 2006.