

Socio-Historical Nature of the Dynamics of Paradigmatic Education

Nadezhda Ivanisheva

Orenburg State Pedagogical University, Orenburg, Russia

Abstract: The scientific community allocates the science of science category “paradigm” with the highest methodological status. The appeal to historical dynamics of a paradigmatic education allowed the revealing the nature of interaction and counteraction of paradigms, paradigmatic approaches and build the strategy of educational activity and carry out scientific substantiation of designed innovative educational model. Shift of paradigms in pedagogical science which is observed in present, belongs to transition from science to practice in pedagogical research. The coexistence of paradigms makes possible the qualitative influence the education updating. The author’s concept on “socio-andragogicalal paradigm” has been formulated. In educational process of university, the paradigm is urged to provide a growing of the student, formation of a subject position, more independence, confidence and responsibility in development of personal potential, ability to continuous professional growth and a demand on a competitive labor market. Dominant paradigms define a sense, direction and the content of transformations in the education system. This demands the appropriate requirements to educational process such as ensuring of training in these skills. The paradigm can be used for diagnostics of the theory and practice of education, definition of prospects of a development of education, the reflexive analysis to reconstruction of socio-historical experience of education.

Key words: Paradigm % Coexistence of paradigms % Dynamics of paradigmatic education % Education update

INTRODUCTION

Scientific and pedagogical knowledge are focused on both the semantic characteristics of the fundamental concepts and simultaneous approval of concepts, theories and paradigms of the whole system of education.

Search, development and implementation of the ways to improve the education system are lawfully performed during a comprehensive analysis of the current situation, referring to the historical experience of its development. Reassessment of the past in education reveals both the errors and missed opportunities, identification of alternative benchmarks in educational systems, determination of the nature of their sources and their implementation.

Relevance of research of education paradigms in the present conditions is stipulated by the strategy of innovative, advanced development of Russian education, providing its qualitative breakthrough and on this basis-a new quality of life of citizens, guarantee of competitiveness and security of the country at the international level.

Concepts of educational paradigms sound more independently and are the focus of the study almost all sciences. However, the scientists have noted a certain lack of the level and scope of scientific research of educational paradigms that generates contradictory interpretations of the questions and solutions in the education system, therefore the approaches of single sciences (philosophy and sociology of education, pedagogics, history and psychology of education, etc.) limited by specificity of separated scientific methodology, do not reach required level of generalization and depth of study of a certain scientific problem.

The Main Part: The subject of our study is the *socio-andragogicalal paradigm* which is accepted as a combination of initial research and teaching standings and categories of scientific knowledge, containing the ideal theoretical character of transformation of the higher pedagogical education: anthropological principles of human education; education as a subjective process of development of objective culture benchmarks; integrated and systematic knowledge about a man in his social

relations and relationships; relevance of andragogical resources (organizational forms, educational methods and technologies of education for adults), which change the experience, the way of thinking and behavior in the development of social and professional roles; concept, recognized among the scientific and educational community at the present stage, fixed in academic papers and educational sources.

There are social and andragogical concepts within the context of socio-andragogical paradigms, which are the system-forming in the formulation and solution of problems of higher pedagogical education and allocated by us as a significant binary oppositions to reveal the common views on the relationship and interaction of social demands and educational system.

Pedagogical value of social-andragogical paradigm includes the models of higher scientifically-potential pedagogical education for the future, responding positively to the demands of society, the individuals and the state. The emphasis in the organization of higher pedagogical education based on social and andragogical paradigm shifts from the domination of competence-based approach, which provides a strong practical orientation of education and the acquisition of diverse experience of activity to socially-based approach, promoting both development of individual potential to the other people and for the transformation of the social environment.

The social and socialization processes in individuals, allowing the qualitatively affect the changes in education to eliminate the contradiction between personal and social human activities are relevant. Pedagogical effect of socio-andragogical paradigm consists in consolidating of the dominant social values and behaviors, overcoming alienation, because it focuses on the individual and the social environment as a factor and the background in self-realization.

The problem of analyzing of the paradigms of the modern national higher education is general issue in our study because the identification and development of specific forms, semantic models to improve the educational process through the implementation of socio-andragogical paradigm, ensuring conformity to adequate modern requirements of individuals, society and state, production and the system of higher pedagogical education have been discussed here.

General scientific term "paradigm" introduced in the philosophy of science to describe normative methodology becomes more popular in the works on the methodology

of pedagogics, philosophy and sociology of education, general and social pedagogics in the present conditions of reforming the educational reality.

Meaning of the term "paradigm" comes from the Greek word "*paradeigma*" and literally means which determines the character of nature, manifestations, being out of appearance ("*para*" means "*super*", "*over*", "*through*", "*about*" and "*deigma*"-"demonstration", "manifestation").

In philosophy and methodology of scientific knowledge, a paradigm is defined as:

- C widely recognized scientific achievements which provide the scientific community to model production problems and solutions during certain period [1, p. 17];
- C fundamental model of the subject of science; it serves for the determination of study object, the study questions and the rules for interpretation of obtained responses [2, pp. 570-571];
- C hidden and nonreflexing structuring reality which always left away and determining basic, fundamental proportions of the human mind and the human being [3, p. 38];
- C methodological construct that integrates fundamental scientific theories to explain the world structure, ways of the new knowledge search about it and the priority value orientations of the scientific community [4, p. 3];
- C leading theory of science (basic approach) and concerning to other, the highest category of scientific knowledge based on binary oppositions, accepted as a model for formulating and solving of problems within a particular historical period, fixed in the textbooks, scientific works and recognized by the scientific community, regardless of knowledge field [5, p. 6].

Differences in the interpretation of the term "paradigm" reflect the diversity of manifestations of the science and multicomponent structure of philosophical and methodological contents. V.V. Kraevskiy noted: "Almost all interpretation of the term "paradigm" in the general methodology of science are combined as the scientific activity but not a scientific object" [6, p. 205].

We suppose that he describes a kind of dominant system of concepts, scientific knowledge, which gives a certain vision of the world to researchers and allows us to solve the philosophical and practical tasks and serves as

a model of scientific thinking. This paradigm unites the scientists into research and education community and directs them to the formulation and solution of research tasks.

We attempted to make the concept on the socio-historical nature of the dynamics of paradigmatic higher education based on a comprehensive analysis of the scientific literature, books and the results of the dissertation research.

Thus, the *first group* of research works included the appropriate publications, where paradigms are considered from different methodological position: P. Bourdieu (constructivistic structuralism), T. Parsons (structural-functional theory of socialization), P. Ricoeur (hermeneutical method), N. Luhmann (the theory of self-referential systems), U. Habermas (the theory of communicative action), G. Haken and B. Chendov (synergetic methodology); the studies of poststructuralists and postmodernists R. Barthes, J. Baudrillard, P. Virilio and J.-F. Lyotard (understanding of a concept as thinking process).

Complex study methodology of education and paradigms of education is presented in the works of A.Ya. Baskakov, B.S. Gershunskiy, L.A. Mikesheva, V.V. Mironov, N.V. Tulenkov and others. Scientists agree that the form of fixation of axiological educational ideas that a paradigm can serve as the form of organization of knowledge about the value and target principles of education. B.S. Gershunsky notes that "fixing accumulated reliable data in a particular field of science, the paradigm, however, appeals both the observation of the data and their assessment, which depends on the system of chosen criteria" [7, p. 270].

The *second group* of authors, who analyze the essential features of the paradigm as a social phenomenon, was conventionally divided into two blocks.

The *first block* includes Socrates and later Plato, Aristotle, A. Augustine, F. Aquinas, K.M. Cantor, J. Loyola, E. Morin, I. Sirin and others where the paradigm was interpreted as objectively existing structure, which carries the parameters of the development of different material, social and cultural systems and objects. Plato uses the term paradigm to describe a whole semantic layer of his doctrine about "ideas" devoted to the relationship of the spiritual transcendental world and the real transcendent world. Ancient thinker has established the existence of the world of "ideas" and "concepts" and also tried to identify the genesis of all things based on the

postulate of the primacy of the ideal. "Paradigm" is not just an idea in the row with the others; it also has the status of primacy, as a prototype and the divine plan. Paradigm refers to the fact that it is always becoming but never exists because it is seen only in becoming and all things are only the result of this.

Plato has developed the ideas of Socrates highlighting the objective status of paradigm, but attributing the paradigm to Creator, demiurge and straggles to some subjectivity. Teleology becomes consistently objective for the first time only in interpretation of Aristotle. Since Aristotle, the invariants of existence and thinking were called as the paradigms. "Paradigm, according to Aristotle, is the ultimate generic form of being of the essence (individual essences of nature) and the ultimate form of the thinking of the God's mind"... "Objective" is reducible to a "form"-to reality of what is given as a possibility in the "matter" of objects".

The meaning of the term "paradigm" has gradually expanded and, as a result, the etymology of the word and its earliest use are different from the meanings that it has acquired later.

Using a "paradigm" in the scientific turn of the speech, the scientists understood this word as subjective structures generated by the individual. This position is typical for members of historical and evolution concepts in philosophy of science of S.T. Kuhn and his followers. In the author's conception of the historical dynamics of scientific knowledge as a shift of scientific communities, the paradigm has been considered as a system of fundamental knowledge and patterns of activity, recognized by scientific community and target studies. According to S.T. Kuhn, a paradigm serves as a disciplinary matrix, which allows the each new member of certain community to carry out the analytical work according to recognized norms, rules and algorithms. Substantive core of the paradigm is the general picture, form, or model of studied reality. Further, S.T. Kuhn specifies that every scientific paradigm is supported by the local scientific community, creates own ways of the world understanding and the criteria of rationality of the received education.

Ideas of S.T. Kuhn were confirmed in a study by F. Capra, carried out by the evaluation of social processes. The author was supported by a community of scientists and practitioners who came to the common conclusion that "paradigm is an integration of concepts, values and practices shared by the community and forming a definite vision of reality of self-organization

basis" [8, p. 6]. In other words, the paradigm integrates the meanings that form the socio-cultural conditioning of actions and changes, which predetermine the direction of scientific researches and implementation of their results in the social practice. F. Capra has compared the two paradigms-the old (classical Cartesian-Newtonian) and the new which he called "ecological" and designed to replace the rational-discrete methodology of orthodox science of the "New time" in the sense of a global generalization.

O.E. Petrunya, V.A. Rybakov and A.L. Pokryshkin have declared the personal nature of the paradigm. They indicated the significant difference between the subject areas of natural and social and humanitarian sciences which revealed "some difficulties of direct transfer of paradigms of natural-science knowledge into the study of society" [9, p. 64].

Interdisciplinary concept of scientists (A.V. Kuznetsov and V.V. Kuznetsov) has created an opportunity to maximal extension of scientific discourse about "the paradigm of social knowledge" and analyze of the educational paradigms based on idea of the perfect society, its reasons and ways of realization.

The *second block* includes authors, which scientific works are devoted to the direct analysis of educational paradigms: the continuity and conformity of educational paradigms (I.B. Romanenko) [10], the need to change the educational paradigms in historical periods of society development (G.L. Ilyin) [11], the questions of the relationship between educational paradigms and civilization dimensions of society (A.N. Shardanov) [12] and the problems of education in the context of scientific paradigms of XXI century (A.G. Asmolov) [13].

The scientist's studies show that educational paradigm serves to express a coherent and objective picture of the cultural world of a man of postindustrial era, depicting him through the prism of junction to traditional values. From a functional point of view, it is a combination of: 1) the scientific-philosophical principles and values that influence the choice of research and educational programs; 2) the ontological and anthropological ideas that define a way of understanding of the world; 3) the corresponding methods of knowledge; 4) the methods of accumulation, reprocessing and transfer of knowledge and some pedagogical methods of education and training deriving from them.

The *third group* of authors devoted their studies to the structure, content and typology of educational paradigms. S.G. Kara-Murza analyses the "genetic matrix" of the culture-the school as a paradigmatic mechanism,

preserved and transmitted from generation to generation the cultural heritage and the ideological principles of the society [14].

Importance of research problems is directly related to the level of their paradigmatic mediation, which indicates the following levels in the structure of a paradigm: 1) a general scientific (philosophical, value-sense ideas); 2) particularly scientific (generalizing the ideas of pedagogical science, psychology, sociology, cultural and others in related sciences); 3) particularized (the ideas of social education and cultural development of the individuals in a situation of leisure and creativity). According to S.T. Kuhn, in each of these levels, there are:

- С a substantial component of the paradigm, which verifies its composition and certain instructions and rules of scientific research;
- С symbolic generalizations (laws, definitions of certain terms);
- С metaphysical elements (determine the processes of the universe and its ontology);
- С values (influence the choice of study directions);
- С standard patterns (diagrams, models of solution of certain scientific and exploratory tasks);
- С dynamic component of the paradigm-there are significant features of the historical time (past-present-future), which offer to researchers the formation, rise and destruction of the scientific paradigm both in "intrascientific" space and in social time.

Over last years, there are number of fundamental monographs, where the authors (A.G. Bermus, T.I. Davydenko, G.L. Ilyin, V.S. Kukushkin, A.Z. Kuszhanova and V.N. Turchenko) provide a thorough and objective analysis of the approaches to the understanding and development of the typology of educational paradigms.

Typology of educational paradigms is being carried out by scientists depending on solution of the philosophical question of the nature (source) education [15], in terms of their historical development and subject-active approach [11]. It is based on criteria such as the cultural context, availability of education for people of all ages, value of education and etc.

From the other side, the scientists (Yu.G. Volkov, Yu.E. Krasnov, A.A. Pinskiy, V.M. Rozin, I. Savitskiy and Kh.G. Tkhapsoev) are proposed the concept of a new educational paradigm-practice, which can be called existential and self-determined educational paradigm of

postmodern epoch. This paradigm should form existential project activity-related attitudes in the young people and appropriate key competencies to help them to adequate treatment of the problems [16].

In the present scientific literature, the approach based on the fact that the typology of educational paradigms is based on both theoretical and practical anthropology, is widely spread. The scientists (N.N. Moiseev, I. Peters, K. Weller, B. Hooks and C. Fritjof) noted that in the present conditions of life of the indigenous change of people's being, the mankind is faced with the alternative: either global ecological collapse or the search for a new outlook and attitudes of the people's activity [17] and in these conditions, there is another approach to the paradigms of modern education which significantly revising the idea of anthropocentrism, giving them the character of noosphere.

A separate block of our study has been represented by scientific works in the field of individual, actually pedagogical paradigms. There are approaches in scientific studies to the typology of educational paradigms relying on different grounds, traditional and humanistic pedagogical paradigms such as: forming and individually oriented (E.V. Bondarevskaya and S.V. Kulnevich), research and technocratic, humanitarian and esoteric (I.A. Kolesnikova), authoritarian, manipulative and maintaining (G.B. Kornetov), authoritarian-peremptory and humane (Sh.A. Amonashvili), cognitively-informational, personal, cultural and competent (E.A. Yamburg), "pedagogy of necessity" and "pedagogy of freedom" (O.S. Gazman), natural science, technocratic, humanistic-esoteric and polyphonic (O.G. Prikot), traditionally-conservative, rationalist and humanistic (V.Ya. Pilipovskiy), pedagogical and ragogicalal, acmeological and communicative (Yu.G. Fokin) and others.

In these the types of educational paradigms, the researchers attempted to conceptually understand some basic models of education, describing and interpreting them from pedagogical point of view as a model of the pedagogical process and the terms of pedagogy as a field of science knowledge. The necessity of this typology, according to the position of G.B. Kornetov, has been defined by "objective need in the regulation and systematization of pedagogical knowledge on existing ways and means of the organization of the educational process. In addition, these efforts have been largely stimulated by objective necessity in the development of the coordinate system, which allows to navigate in almost infinite variety of pedagogical systems, concepts,

theories, technologies, techniques of the past and present" [18, p. 59].

A number of prominent scientists (E.V. Berezhnova, M.V. Boguslavskiy, O.S. Gazman, D. Gartz, I.A. Kolesnikov, V.V. Kraevskiy, G. Muller, L.I. Novikova and R. Yusher, etc.) are characterized the current situation in the social and pedagogical knowledge as a paradigmatic shift. There is a not only radical transformation of paradigm of pedagogic science, but at least, its shift to the value aspects. The modern shift of paradigm of the pedagogical science belongs to the transition from science to practice in pedagogical study (U. Glasser, R.D. Barr, J. Tagg and G. Simmel) [19].

It has been noted in the science that paradigmatic shift is associated with significant change in the research principles and programs, types of thinking and conceptualization, as well as the methods of knowledge of reality. Paradigmatic shift is hardly a substitution of paradigm, but a forerunner and initiator of its crisis.

We have compared the ideas and positions of the authors in this group during analysis of educational paradigms of the modern Russian society.

The *fourth group* of authors includes works which reveal the problem of conflict of educational paradigms in conditions of the development of the controversial unstable society. The analysis of the environment of the social conflict and its educational aspects (A.Y. Antsupov and A.I. Shipilov, W. Beck, R. Darendorf, A.V. Dmitriev, L. Coser, F. Webster and L.N. Tsoi) has considered "the impact of the conflict as a collision of different interests in the selection, implementation and development of educational paradigms and their correlation" [20, đ. 104]. Direct conflict in the educational environment has become the subject of attention of I.Y. Aleksashin, Yu.N. Afanasiev, D.B. McClellan, A.P. Ogurtsov and V.V. Platonov. Value nature of the conflict of educational paradigms was discussed in the works of V.I. Dobrenkov, Kh. Grimen, V.V. Mironov, N.S. Rozov and D.A. Yakovlev. Subjects, objects, methods, means, the nature of the conflict of educational paradigms in Russian society have been considered by S.G. Kara-Murza, A.V. Samarskiy, S.A. Tyushkevich and M. Ferro.

The approaches to the analysis of the specific conflict of educational paradigms described in these studies are used as a methodological tool to study the educational paradigms of Russian society and their relationship to the educational environment of the University.

In the *fifth group*, we classified the studies on

identifying the trends of modifying of educational paradigms, key directions for improving of their functioning and development, conditions and factors to optimize the educational process in the present conditions and future opportunities (D. Dixon, D. Neisbit, A. Neklessa and A. Shubin).

Toffler A. emphasizes the need to extend the education to the perception of the future, use the future as “smart weapons” designed to change a man, develop his astuteness and responsibility. “Our schools are turning back to the vanishing system and are hardly moving to the new society. Their significant energy is aimed to teaching the Industrial People who equipped to survive in the system which will cease to exist before they die” [21, p. 325.]. In order to avoid a possible “futureshock” stress and disorientation in conditions of constant changes in a short time, he concerns the necessary to create a “superindustrial education system” which embodies the goals and methods in the future. In this regard, the scientist insists on some urgent innovations (make the education more mobile, take a student from the audience for active participation in society and establish the links between school and enterprises, etc.).

The *sixth group* includes the ideas of the authors on polyparadigmatic modern education as a result of pluralism and the nature of self-development of society (E.V. Bondarevskaya, E.V. Berezhnova, V.V. Kraevskiy, N.B. Romaeva, I.G. Fomicheva, E.H. Shiyarov, etc.).

Scientists admit the existence of several methodological systems which include the integral, complete models of individual formation and the educational process, expressed in the form of pedagogical theories, technologies, educational systems and pedagogical education. They may differ from each other as fundamentally on the objectives and content, laws and regularities as the mechanism of action and expression and , consequently, by the result. Fomicheva I.G. notes that “transition to the position polyparadigmatic pedagogical thinking will enable more productive forecasting, design and implementation of innovations (combining them with traditions) to harmonize the target positions, founded choice and integrative combination of different educational strategies, policies and procedures at all levels from regional-territorial until individually-personal” [22, p. 12; 23, 24].

Shiyarov E.N. and Romaeva N.B. are defined

“polyparadigmatic principle” as a methodological principle of modern pedagogics and educational practice, emphasizing its following positions:

- С admissibility of coexistence of several methodological systems;
- С orientation of the processes of socialization and individualization of individuals to different paradigmatic principles;
- С the use of different paradigms at strategic (ideological) and operational level by one teacher;
- С dependency of choice of paradigm by a teacher on the formation level of learning motivation of students (both passive and active principles for their own intellectual development);
- С combination of elements of different paradigms within a specific educational technology;
- С existence of single paradigms within the each paradigm with a particular combination of ideas about the goals, content and process of education and training [23, p. 24; 26]. They emphasize the dependence of the choice of pedagogical paradigm on the professional level of teachers.

The *seventh group* of sources combines the state and legal papers and documents, regulating and governing the social relations in the field of education and establishing the development direction of educational paradigms in higher pedagogical education.

CONCLUSION

In scientific literature cited in this study, the scientists express different opinions, approaches and opinions on the problem of educational paradigms in social and cultural field of higher education, integrated with the modern society. However, it should be noted that the scope of some studies are still behind of investigation and require the urgent attention and first of all, a new, modern educational situation in the country caused by the constant changes in the national education and Russia’s entry into the joint European educational space must be revised. In these circumstances, there is a tendency to increase the impact of the educational sphere, on the one hand and decrease of the overall level of educational culture and on the other this creates a contradictory situation, whose influence on public life is unpredictable.

Secondly, the contradictions between the emerging

views on the role and purpose of education in the life of people of different ages and persistent views of many people on the nature and content of the educational process at the university has to be solved.

Third, in the present, there are unsolved questions on value of the educational process, orientation of conflict between educational paradigms, identification and substantiation of the major tendencies of development of educational paradigms in a changing society. There is an urgent need to identify and theoretically substantiate the educational paradigms, their models and principles that positively affect the preparation of highly professional teachers of a new generation.

REFERENCES

1. Kuhn, S.T., 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago University Press, pp: 252.
2. Ritster, J., 2002. *Modern Sociological Theories*. St. Petersburg: Piter.
3. Berezhnova, E.V. and V.V. Kraevskiy, 2007. Scientific Paradigm and Tendencies of Development of Education. *Pedagogika*, 1: 22-28.
4. Bondarevskaya, E.V., 2007. Paradigm as a Methodological Regulation of Pedagogical Science and Innovative Practice. *Pedagogika*, 6: 3-10.
5. Savotina, N.A., 2012. A Term "Paradigm" and Its Status in Pedagogics. *Pedagogika*, 10: 3-10.
6. Kraevskiy, V.V. and E.V. Berezhnova, 2008. *Methodology of Pedagogics: A New Stage of Development*. Moscow: Akademiya, pp: 400.
7. Gershunskiy, B.S., 2002. *Philosophy of Education in XXI Century*. Moscow: Pedagogicheskoe Obshchestvo Rossii, pp: 512.
8. Capra, F., 2002. *Life Web. New Scientific Understanding of Live Systems*. Kiev: Sofia, pp: 314.
9. Rybakov, V.A. and A.L. Pokryshkin, 2005. Is Psychology Combined with Natural-Scientific Paradigm? *Tomsk*, pp: 273.
10. Romanenko, I.B., 2003. Educational paradigms in the history of philosophy, Extended Abstract of Dissertation Doctoral Phil. Sciences, St. Petersburg.
11. Iliyev, G.L., 2009. *Philosophy of Education*. Moscow: Vuzovskaya Kniga, pp: 326.
12. Shardanov, A.N., 2004. Development of new educational paradigm as the part of modern civilization processes, Extended Abstract of Dissertation Doctoral Phil. Sciences, Nalchik.
13. Asmolov, A.G., 2003. Neoactive Paradigm in Thinking of XXI Century: Activity as an Existence. *Mir Psikhologii*, 2(34): 155-158.
14. Kara-Murza, S.G., 2001. Soviet Civilization. In: *From the Great Victory to the Present*. Moscow: Algoritm-Kniga, pp: 688.
15. Bermus, A.G., 2008. *Modernization of Education: Philosophy, Policy and Culture*. Scientific Monograph. Moscow: Russkaya Rech, pp: 274.
16. Volkov, Yu. G., On New Paradigm of Education. [http://ippk.edu.mhost.ru /content/ blogcategory /44/62](http://ippk.edu.mhost.ru/content/blogcategory/44/62).
17. Moiseev, N.N., 1998. *Simplicity Apart*. Moscow: Agraf, pp: 480.
18. Peters, I. and K. Weller, 2008. Paradigmatic and Syntagmatic Relations in Knowledge Organization Systems. *Information-Wissenschaftund Praxis*, 59(2): 100-107.
19. Fritjof, C., 1997. *The Web of Life: A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems*. New York, pp: 6.
20. Darendorf, P., 1999. Elements of the theory of the social conflict // *Sociological researches*, 2: 103-110.
21. Kornetov, G.B., 2009. *Basic Pedagogics*. Moscow: Akademiya Sotsialnogo Upravleniya, pp: 342.
22. Glasser, U., 1991. *School without Failures* (Transl. from English). Moscow: Progress, pp: 184.
23. Barr, R.D. and J. Tagg, 1995. From Teaching to Learning-A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education. *Change*, November/December: 13-25.
24. Simmel, G., 1991. *Conflict of Modern Culture in On Individuality and Social Forms*. Chicago University Press, pp: 274.
25. Powershift: Alvin Toffler on the Age of Post-Fact Knowledge and the Super-Symbolic. 1990. New York: Economy, pp: 307.
26. Walzer, M., 2004. *Politics and Passion. Towards a More Egalitarian Liberalism*. London: Yale Univ. Press.