

Publication date: 15.09.2024
DOI: 10.24412/2782-6570-2024_03_03_8
UDC 796.011.1:316.334.55/56-057.8(476)

THE CONCEPT OF FORMING PERSONAL MOTOR CULTURE IN SOCIAL AND PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITIES OF THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS

P.V. Snezhitskij

Grodno State Medical University, Grodno, Republic of Belarus

Annotation. The article presents theoretical analysis, synthesis and substantiation of conceptual provisions for the formation of personal motor culture in the ontogenesis of a modern person in the conditions of a rural biogeosociocenosis. The aim of the study: development and theoretical substantiation of the scientific concept of the formation of personal motor culture in social and professional communities of rural areas of the Republic of Belarus. The concept of the formation of personal motor culture in a rural community is substantiated, which is a civilizational and historical phenomenon of social, cultural and environmental modification and modernization of an individual's motor aspect in accordance with a specific biogeosociocenosis (the combination of the influence of natural, social, educational, industrial, professional and everyday conditions of the surrounding environment).

Keywords: personal motor culture, biogeosociocenosis, social and professional communities, general educational institutions in rural areas.

Introduction. Any manifestation and development of biological life in nature is not possible without movement of the seen (performed by a living organism) and the unseen (occurring in a living organism).

In the civilizational aspect we always associate the term “culture” with human population, noting that the creation of any cultural values is possible only by a human [1-3]. Such statement may be justified in regards to the most types of both social and personal culture. However, it is different in terms of physical culture. If we consider a human body from a cultural and anthropological point of view as one of the universal cultural values occurred in the process of its self-creation, and man himself as the pinnacle of creation, it will be obvious that the roots of this issue come to phylogenesis of the Earth's fauna [4-5]. It was through the biological evolution of species that the cultural elevation of a man over the animal world happened, first as *Homo habilis* and then as *Homo sapiens* [1, 6, 7].

Aim of the study – to analyze, synthesize and justify conceptual provisions for the formation of personal motor culture in the ontogenesis of a modern person in the conditions of a rural biogeosociocenosis.

Methods and organization. An analysis of scientific and methodological literature on the issue was conducted. A total of 41 research materials were analyzed in the study.

Results and discussion. *Homo habilis* is associated with the origin of the early “oldowan” culture, marked by a creation of primitive stone tools and transition from carnivory to omnivory. *Homo sapiens* is related to the “aurignacian” culture represented by the well-developed intelligible speech, clothing creation and wearing and food thermal processing [3]. In both cases, along with the development of the object culture, we see the increasing development of motor culture that allows to translate mental images into material objects and language constructions (human speech), accompanying and improving the quality of a man's life activity [6-7].

Such phenomenon of a progressive development of everyday motor culture of a man intensely carried on until the formation of industrial society, during which there was a period of relative stagnation. The post-industrial period was indicated with regression of everyday motor culture for the majority of the human population in the countries that currently call themselves developed [3, 7]. In the era of

scientific and technical revolution and global information technology development in the world community, the motor culture improvement in different fields of life activity has become the task of complex and high-precision machines and mechanisms [7]. This, in turn, with food prosperity in the background (but not the nutrition culture), contributed to “deculturation” of motor culture and, consequently, “deculturation” of corporality of an individual and human population as a whole – the two main components of a personal physical culture [6-8].

Therefore, the creation by the modern states of social and pedagogical conditions that help each individual to become aware of their own place in the social and historical period of motor and corporeal “deculturation” and, most importantly, to start the pursuit for and fulfill a substitute for motor and cultural alternative to the lost everyday life-supporting motor activity is the main goal of the social and pedagogical paradigm (realization of personal educational potentialities in an open society) and the first conceptual position of our scientific concept of forming personal motor culture in the modern society.

Considering the term “physical culture” (from the Greek “φύσις” – nature) from the point of semantics as natural culture or culture of nature, it is necessary to note that its commonly used form is directly connected with human beings, although there is no direct indication of this in the word combination itself [7, 9]. No one uses the term in relation to other species of the Earth’s fauna (or flora). Nevertheless, they, like human, have the same cultural and biological values [10]. Therefore, the term should be considered as directly related to the human being, as well as to both natural and universal value (human body as an object of biological evolution and self-creation). The implication is that the “pinnacle of creation” is made not only due to their own self-creative activity, but also due to the processes of biological evolution, i.e. mechanisms of all-round adaptation (man adaptation to the environment) and “anti-adaptation” (adaptation of the environment to man), respectively increasing or decreasing the level of their personal

motor and cultural self-organization [7]. In the course of the last century, in most areas of human culture, the process of anti-adaptation, which still consists of the same motor activity, aimed at the comfort of physical labor, involved everything, which was detrimental to the motor and cultural development of an individual and human population in whole [11-12].

Such view on things allows us to dive deeply into the essence of origin of physical culture as the culture of human nature represented by the body culture and the culture of motor activity. The latter one lies in the basis of all other types of personal culture (ecological, aesthetic, labor, household, gastronomic et al).

Since the main value of human self-creation and the instrument of embodiment of most material (perceived by the senses) human culture is the human hand [10, 13, 14], and its tool is motor activity [12, 15, 16], that allows to turn the conceived (thought) into a physical body (a household object, or an object for spatial or plastic art: sculpture, graphics, painting and architecture) or an informational body (a verbal object of temporary performing art, which occurs only here and now: dance and music), it is the level of this motor activity’s culture that determines the quality of embodiment of mental objects, from primitive and talentless to talented and exceptional. The quality of objectifying thoughts in cultural values is estimated with the senses – “specialized peripheral, anatomical and physiological system that due to its receptors contributes to the acquisition and initial analysis of information that comes from the outside world and other organs of the body, i.e. external environment” [17-18]. Therefore, the culture of motor activity (or, in other words, motor culture) is both a tool for creation and the product of culture of not only one individual, but also the world human culture in whole. This statement is a second conceptual position of the scientific concept of personal motor culture formation, which allows us to see a person as not only “the measure of all things”, but also as their creator (including themselves) through self-realization via their own motor culture in specific natural and environmental conditions. The objectification of a human’s thoughts in regards to themselves (embodiment of motor

activity and corporeal images) is a process of motor and somatic self-creation (a purposeful totality of all live activity's motor actions) and the results of their own physical culture. From the priorities of each individual the physical culture of the local community, population and species of a whole is formed.

In modern historiography it is accepted to consider that the active development of human culture began with the creation of the first cities [19], when the rules of co-existence required a new arrangement of settlement and life support infrastructure, and before that there were only its rudiments [20]. Nevertheless, considering the human motor culture development from the moment of its creation and use of the first tools of labor up to the present time, it is possible to speak about its origins as motor algorithms of individuals in the natural environment and as cultural heritage of the human population [21]. The same lies in the historical foundation of motor culture manifested through the perfection of games and dances showing the ways of hunting, farming, housekeeping, caring for the younger generation, home and property defense and other from generation to generation [20]. Such activities are present nowadays in a form of outdoor games. They help children to learn these motor algorithms to prepare them for adult life activity in a particular social and demographic community.

Thus, we can associate the origin of the personal motor culture with small tribal communities in close proximity to nature, in the modern world – biogeosociocenosis of rural areas. This is the reason why the modern rural community in different countries is on one way or another a carrier of “motor cultural relics” of the human population to a greater extent compared with the urban community, and the motor culture of the rural community is of primary importance compared with that of the urban community. Such statement is our third conceptual position of the scientific concept of forming personal motor culture, allowing us to consider the rural community as a carrier of original motor and cultural heritage, which has deep cultural and historical roots.

When studying the historical development of social and economic infrastructure of rural areas over the last century, it is important to note its rapid development in the Republic of Belarus over the last 20 years, which allows us to speak about the practical “erasure” of the boundary between the village and the city in terms of providing the benefits of civilization [22]. When giving a social and historical estimation of the educational system of the rural community, it should be also noted that the rural school has been the main (and often the only) cultural and educational center in the rural community [23-24]. It has been repeatedly proven by life itself, and shutting up a village school condemns the village itself to death [25-39].

The effective organization of modern infrastructure (educational, cultural, trade, consumer and communal services, communications, post office et al) in rural areas is concentrated in settlements of a new type – “agricultural towns” [40-41]. Provision of comfortable housing in agricultural towns contributes to solving the problem of centralizing production and labor resources, social and cultural provision for the majority of the rural population [25, 28, 41]. This circumstance allows us to assume the probability of effective realization of potential opportunities of rural residents through the creation of favorable pedagogical conditions for the formation of the educational space in rural schools for all its subjects as a field of motor culture as the basis of health formation of the rural population as a whole. This statement is our fourth conceptual position of the scientific conception on forming personal motor culture in the rural community.

In the light of the information provided above, the concept of forming personal motor culture in professional and social communities of the rural area has logical and theoretical basis that allows us to construct scientific and practice-oriented educational activity through search for effective approaches to provide favorable pedagogical conditions of everyday motor life of the rural population, contributing to a sufficient level of self-creation and health

formation of its representatives in postnatal ontogenesis with the involvement of great natural potential of rural biogeosociocenosis.

Therefore, relevance may be attributed to our proposed understanding of the concept of forming personal motor culture in the rural community, represented by the theoretical and methodological justification of a new scientific direction in the physical culture theory, defined by the categorical and conceptual system of the “personal motor culture” phenomenon, relevant for social (rural residents) and professional (professional and corporate communities of rural areas) communities on a three-level basis from the philosophical (dialectical, cultural and historical), general scientific (general scientific and pedagogical) and specific scientific (didactic, social and pedagogical) points of view.

The categorical and conceptual system of such direction includes a set of accompanying definition clusters of “personal motor culture”, based on the scientific and theoretical justification of the introduction of reference motor algorithms in the everyday life activity of the rural community, contributing to health formation of the human body as a universal value. The antagonist in this situation is the term “motor personal anti-culture” which is defined as a set of irrational motor algorithms that do not possess universal value, clog the motor sphere and lead to the destruction of human body and health, as well as the reduction of the social status of an individual in society.

The concept of forming personal motor culture in the rural community is a civilizational and historical phenomenon of social, cultural and environmental modification and modernization of the motor sphere of an individual in a particular biogeosociocenosis (a comprehensive influence of natural, social, educational, production, professional and living conditions of the surrounding space). Consideration of this concept is proposed on a two-level social and pedagogical basis:

- the first level involves the evolutionary and civilizational “spontaneous modification of personal motor culture based on corporeal adaptation to the “background” everyday motor activity. In this case, the realization of the ontogenetic aspect of a personality occurs through

family and social pedagogy, as well as motor experience of a particular community, in which the individual lives. Consequently, the number of personal motor culture modifications will correspond with a number of communities in which it provides its life activity. The first level serves as a foundation for the second one;

- the second level includes a pedagogically controlled modernization of personal motor culture based on correction of modes and ways of everyday “background” motor activity by introducing reference motor algorithms (poses, locomotions, imitations and manipulations), as well as stimulating creative self-realization of motor potentials in different fields of motor art and sport. Thus, the leading role in human ontogenesis is played by pedagogically guided mechanisms of biological adaptation. This allows to more successfully realize the health-forming and creative components of social and cultural potential of the rural community within ontogenesis of a particular individual by means of social and developmental pedagogy.

Conclusion. As a result of the theoretical analysis and synthesis, based on practical experience in the study of the development of public education in rural areas in general and physical culture in particular, we can identify the main theses of the concept of forming personal motor culture in rural society:

1. To fully replace the lost natural life-supporting everyday motor activity, the modern rural community needs to create favorable pedagogical conditions of the educational space of rural schools acceptable by the predominant majority of its subjects in the field of motor culture both directly in the educational institution and in the place of residence of the latter.

2. After creating favorable pedagogical conditions of the rural schools’ educational spaces, the next stage in the realization of conceptual provisions should be the development and implementation of pedagogical technologies for the formation of personal motor culture, which could be based on the preservation and application of “motor cultural relics” (as motor cultural heritage of mankind) for health-formation of the rural population via personal self-realization through their own motor culture in

particular natural and environmental conditions.

3. The foundation of the pedagogical technology of forming personal motor culture in rural community should include criteria of the everyday motor culture education: from the position of motor diversity consistency (pose, locomotion, manipulation and imitation), from the position of activity duration (optimization and rationalization) and from the position of activity discreteness (timely change in activity

as the basis of the regime of everyday labor and rest), as well as the position of the activity's quality – a system of comprehensive pedagogical assessment of motor and cognitive maturity, based on empiric indicators for objective identification of the level of motor and cultural proficiency. The aforementioned criteria may be realized via pedagogical diagnosis and estimation of a human motor sphere, individualization of motor activity formation and their motor and cultural proficiency.

Conflict of interest. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Stolyarov V.I. Dialectics as the logic and methodology of science. Moscow: Politizdat, 1975. 247 p. (in Russ.)
2. Chumakov A.N. Cultural-civilizational research: their role and value in the global world. *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Seria 27. Globalistika i geopolitika*, 2018, no. 1. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kulturno-tsivilizatsionnye-issledovaniya-ih-rol-i-tsennost-v-globalnom-mire> (accessed 21.02.2023). (in Russ.)
3. Panov E.N. Man – creator and destroyer: evolution of behavior and social organization. Moscow: Publishing house “YASK”, 2017. 634 p. (in Russ.)
4. Kuramshin Yu.F., Grigor'ev V.I., Latysheva N.E., Dvejrina O.A., Aksenov V.P., Vydrin V.M., Moiseev N.M., Titorova O.N., Marishchuk V.L., Romanenko N.V., Shitikova G.F., Popov V.I., Grigor'ev V.I. Theory and methodology of physical culture: a textbook for universities. Kuramshina Yu.F., ed. Moscow: Sovetskij Sport, 2004. 463 p. (in Russ.)
5. Bal'sevich V.K. Essays on developmental human kinesiology: a textbook. Moscow: Sovetskij sport, 2009. 220 p. Available at: <https://e.lanbook.com/book/10833> (accessed 08.07.2023). (in Russ.)
6. Stolyarov V.I. Modern theory of the physical education (problems, solutions, the innovative conception). *Science and sport: current trends*, 2016, no. 1. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sovremennaya-teoriya-fizicheskogo-vospitaniya-problemy-puti-resheniya-innovatsionnaya-kontseptsiya> (accessed 29.02.2023). (in Russ.)
7. Stolyarov V.I. Innovative concept of modernizing the theory and practice of physical education. Litres, 2017. 1036 p. (in Russ.)
8. Snezhitskij P.V. Motor culture: genesis, state, problems: a monograph. Grodno: Grodno State Agrarian University, 2022. 299 p. (in Russ.)
9. Matveev L.P., Polyanskij V.P. Application of physical culture: conceptual principles and their concretization in contemporary conditions. *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 1996, no. 7, pp. 42-43. (in Russ.)
10. Larina T.A. Anthropology. Genetic aspects of evolution. *Journal of Mining Institute*, 2010, no. 7. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/antropologiya-geneticheskie-aspekty-evolyutsii> (accessed 09.08.2021) (in Russ.)
11. Stolyarov V.I. Philosophy of physical culture and sports activities and human corporality (history, current state, author's concept): a monograph. Moscow: Rusains, 2017. 264 p. (in Russ.)
12. Korenberg V.B. Notes on the culture of movements. Gymnastics. 2nd issue. Moscow: Fizicheskaya Kul'tura I Sport. 2010. pp. 14-18. (in Russ.)
13. Anthropology of professions: collection of scientific articles. Romanov P.V., Yarskaya-Smirnova E.R., ed. Saratov: Center for Social Politics and Gender Studies; Nauchnaya kniga, 2005. 464 p. Available at: https://books.google.by/books?hlru&lr=&id=KzQrkFU50pMC&oi=fnd&pg=PA7&dq=P.+V.+Romanov&ots=4i0RDSGG5x&sig=FWt80aT4QDh02NrJ65sTzX07ZE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=P.%20V.%20Romanov&f=false (accessed 27.12.2021). (in Russ.)
14. Snezhitsky P., Romanova E., Bolotin A. Results of testing an improved methodology for assessing the dynamic performance of rural population in Belarus. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport* ® (JPES), 2024, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 29-35.
15. Korenberg V.B. On some basic notions of our sphere. *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 2007, no. 2, pp. 11-12. (in Russ.)
16. Kurys' V.N. Evstigneeva M.I. Content and correlation of the terms “physical culture of

- personality” and “bodily and physical culture”. *Scientific notes of P.F. Lesgaft University*, no. 11 (95), 2013, pp. 79-87. (in Russ.)
17. Sirotkina, I.E. Motor culture as an object of science. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, 2018, no. 6, pp. 23-27. (in Russ.)
18. Sirotkina I.E. Sources for a non-existent discipline: on what source study basis to create the history of motor culture? History of science and technology: origins, monuments, legacy. Materials of the International Scientific Conference. Available at: <https://www.academia.edu> (accessed 12.01.2021). (in Russ.)
19. Shnyukov V.V. Universal human values as a subject of philosophical understanding. *University News. North-Caucasian Region. Social Sciences*, 2005, no. 3. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/obschechelovecheskie-tsennosti-kak-predmet-filosofskogo-osmysleniya> (accessed 05.08.2021). (in Russ.)
20. Grigor'evich V.V. General history of physical education and sports: study guide. Moscow: Sovetskij sport, 2008. 286 p. (in Russ.)
21. Lyuban T.N. History and contemporary state of pedagogical anthropology in Russia. *Vestnik Pravoslavnogo Sviato-Tikhonovskogo gumanitarnogo universiteta. Seria 4: Pedagogika. Psikhologiya*, 2011, no. 20. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/istoriya-i-sovremennost-pedagogicheskoy-antropologii-v-rossii> (accessed 06.07.2020) (in Russ.)
22. Fomenkova S.F. Agricultural towns of Belarus: present state and future prospects. *Herald of the MACI*, 2018, no. 3 Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/agrogorodki-belarusi-sovremennost-i-perspektivy> (accessed 05.11.2019) (in Russ.)
23. Gusev D.A., Lebedeva O.V. Interaction between school and university in the education of rural school students. *Nachalnaya shkola*, 2022, no. 9, pp. 59-61. DOI: 10.51906/0027-7371_2022_9_59. EDN MGTGEQ. (in Russ.)
24. Kuz'min Yu.A., Medvedeva L.F. System-structural analysis of numerical composition dynamics of agricultural population of the Belarus Republic. *Educational Bulletin "Consciousness"*, 2017, no. 12. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sistemno-strukturnyy-analiz-dinamiki-chislennosti-selskogo-naseleniya-respubliki-belarus> (accessed 08.07.2022). (in Russ.)
25. Pakush L.V. Mirenkova I.V. Conceptual foundations of employment formation in rural areas. Collection of scientific papers “Problems of Economics”. Ministry of Agriculture and Food of the Republic of Belarus. Gorki: Belarussian State Agricultural Academy, 2021, no. 2 (33), pp. 105-114. (in Russ.)
26. Gorbushov A.A. Sociocultural approach in assessing effectiveness of rural schools. *Yaroslavl pedagogical bulletin*, 2022, no. 3 (126), pp. 8-16. (in Russ.)
27. Tarasenko L.V. Rural school in modern Russian society: sociocultural analysis. *Vestnik TGPI*, 2008, no. 2, pp. 231-232. (in Russ.)
28. Fadeeva I.M., Kuryshova L.N., Kalatsina O.S. Demographic challenge to rural schools. *Vestnik of Moscow State Linguistic University. Social Sciences*, 2019, no. 4 (837), pp. 184-201. (in Russ.)
29. Tsirul'nikov A.M. Strategies and models of rural school development. *Bulletin of the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Foundation*, 2000, no. 1, pp. 170-183. (in Russ.)
30. Mendibaev N. The village as an anthroposocial integrity in a transforming society. Bishkek, 2014. 364 p. (in Russ.)
31. Palyukh B.V., Semenov N.A., Vetrov A.N., Borisov A.L. Information and analytical system “Planning the structure of a network of small rural schools”. *Software and systems*, 2002, no. 2, pp. 42-45. (in Russ.)
32. Pchela I.V. The economic conditions of teachers of rural schools in the Primorsky region in 1900-1914. *Ojkumena. Regional researchers* 2019, no. 2, pp. 55-61. (in Russ.)
33. Semenova G.I. Health protection technologies in a small rural school. *Tomsk State Pedagogical University Bulletin*, 2010, no. 1 (91), pp. 66-69. (in Russ.)
34. Solovchenkov S.A. Rural school and its role in maintaining social and formed the role of education. *Privolzhskij nauchnyj vestnik*, 2011, no. 4 (4), pp. 116-119. (in Russ.)
35. Borovik V.G. Preservation of ungraded schools, or good wishes of the Russian Ministry of Education. *Public education*, 2020, no. 1, pp. 56-60. (in Russ.)
36. Gorbushov A.A. “At the crossroads: rural schools in Russia facing a choice of development paths”: monograph. Ekaterinburg: Publishing house of the Ural University, 2016. 124 p. (in Russ.)
37. Gur'yanova M.P. Russian rural school as a socio and cultural phenomenon. *Pedagogika*, 1999, no. 7. Available at: https://portalus.ru/modules/shkola/rus_readme.php?subaction=showfull&id=1191423109&archive=&start_from=&ucat=& (accessed 12.12.2020) (in Russ.)
38. Gur'yanova M.P. Rural school as a basic institution for the formation of the vitality of a

developing personality. Human vitality: individual, professional and social aspects. Makhnach A.V., Dikaya L.G., ed. Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2016. pp. 193-210. (in Russ.)

39. Domashev A.N. Rural school as one of the factors in schoolchildren socialization. *Sociology in the modern world: science, education, creativity*, 2017, no. 9-1, pp. 99-103. (in Russ.)

40. Artyukhin M.I., Pushkevich S.A. Demographic crisis and the ways to overcome it in the conditions

of modern Belarus. *Sotsiologicheskij al'manakh*, 2017, no. 8. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/demograficheskiy-krizis-i-puti-ego-preodoleniya-v-usloviyah-sovremennoy-belarusi> (accessed 05.07.2020). (in Russ.)

41. Blokhin, V.N. Socio-economic changes in rural communities of the Belarusian-Russian border region. Gorki: BGSMA, 2020. 178 p. (in Russ.)

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

Pavel V. Snezhitskij – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Physical Education and Sport, Grodno State Medical University, Grodno, Republic of Belarus, e-mail: snezhickij@gmail.com.

For citation: Snezhitskij P.V. The concept of forming personal motor culture in social and professional communities of the Republic of Belarus. *Russian Journal of Sports Science: Medicine, Physiology, Training*, 2024, vol. 3, no. 3(11). DOI: 10.24412/2782-6570-2024_03_03_8