

From Development Psychology to Self-Development Psychology

Valentin Ageyev

Kainar University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

The author views the contemporaneity as the transition from the social time to historical time. The social time is characterized by recreation and procreation of the socium. In this respect the individual man acts as the "organ" of the socium, whose meaning of life is procreation of the social means of existence. The social man himself forms as a result of appropriation of norms and models as the means of his functioning. Historical time is characterized by the socium generation. Thereby, the individual man acts as the source of the socium origination, this point of life being the creation of the new social means of existence. The historical man himself forms as a result of creation of new social norms and models as the means of his self-development. By this the author states that the processes of the "externally" determined development are replaced by the process of "internally" determined development, i.e. self-development.

Keywords: social time, historical time, development, self-development.

Lots of facts show that the humankind is on the eve of the new era, when the historical time becomes the reality of its existence. Until now, the existence of the society was determined, to a large extent, by the processes of recreation and procreation of the means of its functioning.

Therefore, the point of existence of the individual man was participation by his action in the global processes of maintaining the social structure unchangeable. Due to the fact that the society acted as the source of all human qualities and means of existence, the man proved to be the individual projection of sociality. The socium acted as the primary reality, while the man was the secondary factor in relation to the socium, an individual organ of the socium, the individual means of the socium self-protection.

The objective *historical process* of social development existed as if it were separated from the actually functioning socium. The actually functioning socium, which had once emerged, sort of broke the components of the integral development process: the emergence processes (origination at the expense of generation) and formation processes (as a result of functioning; establishing). Moreover, the functioning processes substituted entirely the integral development processes.

This state of things is reflected in psychological man development concepts which for many centuries (and some of them even now) have represented theoretical constructions, describing the formation processes and often excluding the emergence processes (origination). For a long period of time psychological theories looked upon the society and all social processes as functioning, self-recreating and self-procreating (Ageyev, 2010). Sociality was understood, as a rule, as the concrete historical society structure representing sort of a separate "point" of the axis of the humankind his-

torical time. The individual man development was understood as his modification as a result of appropriation of the summarized standard social man qualities, objectified in social reality.

Peculiarity of appropriation processes consists in the fact that they cannot exist in isolation and suppose with necessity the processes of modification of appropriation abilities. On the assumption of desobjectification threshold concept (Batishev, 1997) one should keep in mind the special processes of development of appropriation ability itself. In the capacity of such processes, the psychological development concepts either consider, as a rule, the maturation processes or avoid, silently, considering any processes at all.

Appropriation, as the basic individual man development vector, is justified only if the historical time, in a lesser degree, determines the existence character of the socium and the man himself, i.e. when sociality and individuality are mainly determined by the past, and when the historical time doesn't, practically, produce any impact on their existence. In this case, when the past acts as the model of the future, the past social means act as the means of the future individual man existence. Appropriating them, the individual man provides the safe future.

Nowadays, the correlation between the historical and social times starts moving fast towards the historical time. The time of social functioning reduces drastically, the time of historical genesis shows the drastic increase. The integral historical development process interchanges the functioning vector (recreation, reproduction) and the genesis vector (generation; origination). The accent shifts towards the historical time, the processes of the new social quality genesis. This constitutes the so-called development temporalization (Dialectical Logics, 1987).

Under such conditions the method of socium self-identification must be necessarily modified. In "pre-historical" epoch such method was represented by the method of transmission of form (functioning method) of sociality from the past into the future. Such formation took place in the process of appropriation of the past sociality form by the new individual people, new generations. The ideal forms (models; norms) of communication and objective action which were appropriated on the basis of imitation mechanism, supporting interiorization processes, acted in the capacity of the past sociality form.

In the "historical" epoch the method of generation (genesis, production) of the new sociality forms must act in the capacity of the method of socium *self-identification*. Thus, the generation method (method of origination) of sociality forms, not the method of sociality forms procreation, should act as socium self-identification criterion. Thereby, if in the epoch of "pre-historical" socialities psychological theories didn't address the question of the subject of sociality forms generation, because it was viewed as obvious, then in the "historical" epoch this question becomes one of the most important.

The myth of the total socium, as the subject of its own forms of production, possesses real foundations in the social systems which recreate and procreate themselves. In this case each emerging individual man, each new generation finds, actually, the ready-made, fully developed and customary social forms by way of socially accepted models and norms of objective action and communication, existing before and independently of them. Such being the case and due to the fact that the man, in the process of his individual life, doesn't create sociality forms, but only appropriates and procreates them in his individual life, the question of the subject of sociality forms production naturally falls away in the sense that the confidence in the fact that the subject of sociality forms production is the sociality itself, alienated from an individual man, seems immediately obvious. Due to the sociality of their forms, mechanisms and means of production outstep the boundaries of psychological science and should be studied by other sciences. Psychology, however, starts (emerges) from the sort of obvious fact of commonly social ownership of the models and norms of social action (communication).

So, such social nature of models (norms) of social action, natural for functioning of "pre-historical" socialities, is neither natural nor obvious for "historical" socialities and, moreover, requires special substantiation. Dialectical tradition of understanding development as the emergence (generation) of a new quality acts in the capacity of such substantiation. It is customary for dialectical tradition to define emergence by the term "genesis" (Dvoretzkiy, 1976), and the subject of generation is the man who, " ... insofar, grasps such logics of Universum as the one (hence the logics of development) in which the objective action of subject turns this logics into the means of its own existence ... " (Dialectical Logics, 1987).

Thus, in the "historical" socialities, first, the sociality itself is understood as actually historical, i.e. as the actual system of all its *historical forms*; second, the method of genesis of its historical forms acts in the capacity of "historical" socialities self-identification method; third, the individual (creative) man acts in the capacity of the subject of generation (genesis) of sociality historical forms. Historical space of the new sociality forms production becomes his subjective space.

The process of transformation of "pre-historical" socialities into "historical" ones is immediately connected with historical dynamics of the types of mediation and types of factors mediating the man development [" ... mediacy (mediation) – existing or receiving of something by means (with the help of) the other – mediating ... " (Philosophical Encyclopaedia, 1967)]. In this respect it is possible to speak about the historical variety of determining factors (means), the most important of which are *reason, aim, value and sense* (Slobodchikov & Issayev, 2000). This statement may be interpreted in the following way. At the first historical stage the socium acts as the reason, mediating the individual man development. At the second historical stage the socium acts as the aim, mediating the individual man development. At the third historical stage the socium acts as the value,

determining the individual man development. The value acts in the capacity of the factor, generating the man's aims. At the fourth historical stage the socium acts as the sense, mediating the individual man development. The sense is the factor, generating human values.

The above speculation makes it possible to drive to the conclusion that the historical development of socialities is immediately connected with the change of historical types of individual man mediation. The higher the level of sociality historical development, the more mediated the method of individual man existence (development) is, and the more adequate is his attitude towards the objective world. And if the first three "pre-historical" sociality types appear in the capacity of the "externally" given (pre-set) factors, determining the individual man development, then the fourth one, the "historical" type of sociality, presupposes the creation of means and methods of his own development (self-development) by the developing individual man himself (Dialectical Logics, 1986).

This means that in transition from the "pre-historical" sociality epoch to its "historical" epoch changes drastically the character of the individual man development. If the "pre-historical" sociality epoch is characterized by the "externally" conditioned (externally determined) development, then the "historical" sociality epoch is characterized by the "internally" determined development (self-development). The individual man self-development is the method of "historical" sociality self-identification. Sociality self-development is implemented in the individual self-development form. Exactly, self-development, as the universal method of existence, acts in the capacity of the essence common for both the developing man and developing sociality. Exactly, the individual man self-development appears in the capacity of the method of self-developing sociality self-identification.

Self-development processes cannot be described with the help of the mechanism of imitation (appropriation; interiorization/ exteriorization.) description, and practical implementation of self-development processes require different mechanisms, the mechanisms which haven't been described yet in the limits of the development psychology. The strategy of elaboration of the self-development mechanism model consists in psychological analysis of imitation (interiorization) mechanism which, strange as it may seem, hasn't been done in Psychology yet, and ,starting out from the psychological model of imitation mechanism, as the mechanism of "externally" stipulated development, the construction of the model of "internally" stipulated mechanism of development.

A remark should be made before the constructive part. It is well-known that "... the last years have witnessed the active elaboration of self-development theories which derive from the supposition that the man himself determines his fate irrespective of his will. This direction doesn't involve any substantial explicate theories, but only some isolated principles like the principle of development through action, self-designing, suggested by R. Lerner, the idea of personal development control, the idea of critical (unnormative) life events (Sapogova, 2001).

Besides, there exist the view points on the self-development, presented in the works by Tzukerman G. A. (Tzukerman, 1997), Selevko G. K. (Selevko, 1998), Slobodchikov V. I. & Issayev E. I. (Slobodchikov & Issayev, 2000), Maralov V. G. (Maralov, 2002). Comparative analysis of different viewpoints on the essence of self-development is possible on the basis of psychological analysis of mechanisms underlying the suggested self-development processes. In this sense, all variants of self-development, suggested nowadays, are built on the basis of imitation as the mechanism of social means appropriation and development abilities and understood as the abilities to independently apply these appropriated properties and implement the appropriated abilities in one's individual vital functions.

Isolated from the theories quotes above, in our opinion, is the concept of culture generating concept of childhood, suggested by V.T. Kudryavtzev (Kudryavtzev, 1999). If the previous viewpoints can be restricted to appropriation (consumption) of cultural abilities and means for their independent implementation and application in individual vital functions, then the specific feature of V.T. Kudruavtzev's concept consists in the accent on independent creation by children of the new social abilities and means. But despite this breakthrough statement, imitation is also considered as the mechanism supporting culture generation.

Aristotle is known to declare that “ ... the man is the social being ... ” (Martzinkovskaya, Maryutina & Stefanenko, 2005). But it appears, however, that in order to solve the problem of self-development, it is necessary to once again settle into shape the old question of what sociality is, and in what relation sociality and individuality exist.

The Swiss psychologist E. Clapere de is known to be the first in the history of scientific Psychology to opt in self-development. For the first time in Psychology history he rejected the dominating role of biological factor and understanding development as the inborn qualities maturation. He understood self-development as self-unfolding of the internal inborn qualities, which depends on the external surrounding directing the flow of this process (Martzinkovskaya, Maryutina & Stefanenko, 2005). G. S. Hall is known to be one of the first to speak about the existence of special development mechanisms, but it was E. Clapere de who integrated into Psychology the imitation of the surrounding (identification) as one of the leading mechanisms of psyche development.

Though the idea of self-development, i.e. immanent character of development inherent in the psyche itself, had already appeared in the first theories, further investigations showed that without certain conditions and support of the concrete self-development mechanisms action, self-development is reduced to the biological growth without any qualitative transformations (Martzinkovskaya, Maryutina & Stefanenko, 2005).

Further, as the result of numerous investigations, several important development mechanisms were singled out – *interiorization, identification, alienation, conformism, compensation* (Martzin-

kov- skaya, Maryutina & Stefanenko, 2005). Psychological analysis of the above- mentioned development mechanisms afford ground to consider that all of them, in a different degree, can be described as mechanisms supporting interiorization by imitation and reflexion. From this point of view, interiorization is defined as being supported by the unity of imitation and reflexion (Slobodchikov & Issayev, 2000). Identification is supported ,to a greater extent, by imitation. Alienation is supported, to a significant extent, by reflexion. Conformism, as well as identification, is supported by imitation. Compensation is, to a large extent, supported by reflexion.

In our opinion, the idea of self-development as the immanent unfolding of the inborn properties (without external influence or depending on external influences) doesn't remove the man out of captivity of biological or socio-cultural predetermined outcome. Moreover, such self-unfolding is the process independent from the man himself, which, in its turn, either identifies the man's essence or is his essence itself. Thereby, the man is pre-set by his essence (biological or social), determined by it, but he himself doesn't control it and cannot influence it in any way. This means that the essence acts in the capacity of human abilities limit, which he is not able to overcome independently.

From this viewpoint, the value of such self-development seems rather relative, and the man immediately pre-conditioned and limited by his generic essence, which he doesn't control, possesses, in principle, few differences from the pre-set in the same way organism (animal), which doesn't control its essence either. To all appearance, one should seek for the other approaches to the man "escapement". If to understand M. Mamardashvily's thesis on the man as the self-built being in the way that the man builds (creates in himself) both the body and soul, then, first of all, one should model the respective mechanism, which cannot obviously be either imitation or reflexion.

In order to do this, it is necessary, first of all, to establish the boundaries of imitation. Psychological analysis affords ground for the following conclusions. **First**, imitation as the ability to procreate the action-model by the self-assimilating action "works" in the condition of relation "the real form of action-model – the real form of self- assimilating action". **Second**, in the capacity of initial means, supporting the ability of imitation, there acts the objectified (cultural) instrument. **Third**, the result of imitation is the "transmission " of the cultural ideal form of the instrument to the imitating man (Elkonin, 2001). **Fourth**, the transmission of the cultural ideal form of the instrument is possible by the way of word meaning, common for both "transmitting" and "receiving". **Fifth**, the "transmission of cultural ideal form presupposes the ability of the "receiving" man to either indicate the instrument or *know its meaning* apriori (Vygotsky, 1983). **Sixth**, the transmission of the cultural ideal form presupposes the ability of the "receiving" man for reflexion.

The whole aggregate of conditions, listed above, lead to the natural conclusion: the ability to appropriate the ideal forms of social action is peculiar only for a man, who knows apriori their mean-

ing or who can apriori indicate the objects and who possesses apriori the ability for reflexion. This conclusion is made because it is impossible, in the limits of any interiorizing concept, to explain the ability to indicate (or know the meanings of the objects) and the ability for reflexion.

And as the mechanism of interiorization (imitation and reflexion) cannot explain the most fundamental abilities for indication and reflexion, it is necessary to possess the mechanism which can explain this. This mechanism will simultaneously act as the self-development mechanism.

As *the interiorization mechanism* is the mechanism “*externally*” stipulated by cultural development, the psychological means of which are the meanings *inherent in culture* and procreated by the developing man (the fact that all mediations are built by the appropriating man doesn’t, essentially, change anything), then the mechanism sought for must be the mechanism of “*internally*” stipulated self-development, the psychological means of which being the new *cultural meanings*, produced by the developing man himself.

If the initial situation for implementation of interiorization, as the mechanism of cultural development, is the mediated by the cultural object-instrument attitude of the child to the grown up, as the bearer of cultural meanings, then the initial situation for implementation of the creation, as the mechanism of self-development, is the relation of development histories of the objective culture and communication, mediated by the history of cultural instruments development.

Psychological analysis of interiorization (imitation and reflexion) shows that imitation is the procreation of the action-model real form by the real form of self-assimilating action. The thesis of the ideal-real action structure states that such procreation is only possible when the imitating man has the ability of establishing relations between the real and ideal forms of his own action. Due to the fact that such correlation is the conscience, then the shaped consciousness is, consequently, not the result of meanings appropriation, but its initial necessary condition. Such conclusion can be made in the relation to reflexion. Consequently, the interiorization mechanism is neither the mechanism of conscience emergence or reflexion emergence.

The mechanism of creation is the historical structure of transitions, on which the new type of objective action emerges. The moving contradiction is the contradiction between the former type of meanings, as psychological means, and the new type of objective forms. This contradiction is solved at the expense of mastery of the objective forms genesis logics and its transformation into the logics of joint creative action which generates meanings. Created meaning becomes the means of consciousness generation.

References

- Ageyev, V. (2010). *Creative Education as a Way of the Organization of Self-development*. Saarbrück, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Batishev, G. S. (1997). *Introduction into Dialectics of Creative Work*. St. Petersburg, Russia: RHGI.
- Dialectical Logics. V.2. Categories of Essence and Integrity Spheres* (1987). Alma-Ata, Kazakhstan: Science.
- Dialectical Logics. v.I. General Problems. Categories of Proximate Spheres* (1986). Alma-Ata, Kazakhstan: Science.
- Dvoretzkiy, I. H. (1976). *Latin-Russian Dictionary. About 50000 entries* (2nd ed.). Moscow, Russia: Russian Language.
- Elkonin, B.D. (2001). *Psychology of Development: Study Guide for University Students*. Moscow, Russia: Publishing Centre "Academia".
- Kudruavtzev, V.T. (1999). *Psychology of Man Development*. Riga, Latvia: "Experiment".
- Maralov, V. G. (2002). *Fundamentals of self-actualization and self-development: Study Guide for pedagogical colleges students*. Moscow, Russia: Centre "Academia".
- Martzinkovskaya T.D., Maryutina T.M. & Stefanenko T.G. (2005). *Psychology of Development: Study Guide of University Psychology specialties* (2nd ed.). Moscow, Russia: Publishing Centre "Academia".
- Philosophical Encyclopaedia. v.4 Head Editor F.V. Konstatinov* (1967). Moscow, Russia: Soviet Encyclopedia.
- Sapogova, E. E. (2001). *Psychology of Man Development: Study Guide for Universities*. Moscow, Russia: Aspect Press.
- Selevko, G. K. (1998). *Modern Education Technologies*. Moscow, Russia: People's Education.
- Slobodchikov, V. I., & Issayev E. I. (2000). *Fundamentals of Psychological Anthropology. Psychology of Man Development: Subjective Reality Development in Ontogenesis: Study Guide for Universities*. Moscow, Russia: School Press.
- Tzukerman, G. A. (1997). *Self-development Psychology: the task for teenagers and their teachers*. Riga, Latvia: "Experiment".
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1983). *Collected works in 6 vol. V.3. Problems of Psyche Development / History of the Highest Psychic Functions Development*. Moscow, Russia: Pedagogics