

UDC 111:130.2/.3+37.012.1

L. I. TKACHENKO^{1*}, A. A. ILINA^{2*}^{1*}Institute of the Gifted Child of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine), e-mail Tkachenko.Lidiya@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-2303-1147^{2*}Institute of Pedagogy of National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine), e-mail aailina@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0001-7260-8398**Giftedness as a Factor in Constituting a Creative Person**

Purpose. The basis of the presented study is a philosophical and anthropological analysis of the problem of creativity in the modern educational space, which is complemented by information and digital reality underlying the changes in the values and meanings of the individual, which led to the affirmation of the digital person (*homo digitalis*). This circumstance, in the context of understanding the need for civilizational development, poses the problem of consistently solving the following tasks: 1) to conduct a review and identify a theoretical and methodological explanation of the content and meaning of the activities of a *homo digitalis* in the context of the transformation of cultural values and methods of communication; 2) to analyse the conceptual content of the phenomenon of giftedness and the emergence of creativity in the discourse of philosophical anthropology and philosophy of education; 3) to expound the main parameters of the intersubjective nature of giftedness in the context of the formation of a creative personality. **Theoretical basis.** The dynamic process of forming a new anthropological type of person (*homo digitalis*) brings the philosophy of education to a new level of theoretical and philosophical understanding. The philosophical and anthropological dimension of *homo digitalis* allows us to determine the prospects for supporting giftedness as a condition for the formation and development of a creative personality as a whole of cognitive, existential and metaphilosophical content. The relevance of the problem is due to the crisis of the axiological meanings of human existence in the situation of the establishment of digital culture, which, as a result of the powerful influence of information and digital reality, causes a change in the culture of communication – from written culture to the culture of memes. This ultimately leads to the establishment of patterns and stereotypes of behaviour and thinking, which become an obstacle to the development of giftedness. **Originality.** It is substantiated that the phenomenon of giftedness largely determines the strategy for the formation of an active creative personality in the conditions of civilizational challenges that have arisen before humanity and Ukraine, strives for progressive development, and therefore opens up new prospects for the development of national identity, taking into account a qualitatively different phenomenon of the anthropological type of man. **Conclusions.** The modern era demonstrates the constitution of digital culture, which gives rise to a new anthropological type of man – *homo digitalis*. Taking into account the serious challenge that digital culture creates, philosophical and anthropological discourse, focused on civilizational progress, is able to provide the necessary vectors of development. The affirmation of the conceptual provisions of the phenomenon of giftedness and creativity proves their influence on the development of education, scientificity, creativity as characteristics of a civilized person. Education is able to prepare a creative person, ready for activity and creativity in the dynamics of technological and socio-cultural transformations and challenges.

Keywords: digital man; philosophical anthropology; creativity; culture; values; education; knowledge; intelligibility

Introduction

One of the most important factors in the constitution of man as a social, intellectual, moral, and cultural phenomenon is education as a condition for further development. The modern world, in which information has taken the first place in relation to knowledge, makes this factor particularly significant. After all, we are now talking about the establishment of a new anthropological type of human being – *homo digitalis*. The concept of the human image, in contrast to its ideologised strata, has been and remains an essential theoretical way of cognition and self-knowledge of societies. From M. Zichy's (2017) point of view, the human image is a "historical-cultural a priori" of the life world of society, which retains its significance in different societies characterised by their own structure and cultural peculiarity (p. 20).

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

In theoretical works where authors analyse the anthropological problems of digital (information and digital) culture, they consider the "digital being" as an "ethno-arithmetic being" in order to identify its peculiarities and the problematic nature of entering other life structures and forms of existence through "phenomenological reduction" (Capurro, 2017, p. 11). Such explanations usually focus on the semantic meaning of concepts, referring to the philosophical heritage of antiquity, especially the philosophy of Plato, and nowadays – to the phenomenological doctrine of theoretical analysis, initiated by E. Husserl (1970).

In European philosophical studies, the expression *homo digitalis* (digital man) is an abstract symbol. On the one hand, this expression describes the main features of a person who has mastered modern digital technologies, uses them productively in practical activities and is at the same time the creator of information and digital culture. On the other hand, it is a typical image of a modern person who is comfortable in the infrastructure of the "entertainment society". This image demonstrates the external characteristics of representatives of digital culture – people who mechanically press their fingers on the signs on the screen of a tablet or smartphone (*digitalis* in Latin means both a number and a finger) to get from them a particular "primitive product in the form of an information service, entertainment or trivial time-killing". To clarify the significance of this semantic connotation, let us recall that the Latin phrase *computare digitalis* translates as "to count on the fingers" and "to operate" "with the help of fingers" (Kultaieva, 2020, p. 11). According to A. Reckwitz, digital identities have changed significantly in recent years. If in the early period of the establishment of digital culture, users of information networks were "experimenting" with their identities and social roles in the information and digital space, now we can talk about the beginning of the process of formation of digital identities, which are increasingly adjusting themselves to the supposedly ideal models and examples of behaviour recorded in networks, where everything "different, unexpected and original" is rejected (Reckwitz, 2017, p. 268).

To this should be added another thing: the flow of information and its processing in huge centres with powerful analytical functions are diversifying society at all levels, creating unprecedented opportunities in all areas of human activity – from economics, education to medicine, agriculture and everyday life. The emphasis on combining mixed reality, artificial intelligence and quantum computing is turning our field of vision into a computer screen, making the digital world and the world of real life a single entity. The era of information and digital technologies is the beginning of a new culture. It can "robotise" humanity, and for many people this will radically change their activities, environment, family life, identity, and can lead humanity to a new collective and moral consciousness (Schwab & Davis, 2018).

Researchers V. Kremen and V. Ilin emphasize another aspect of the problem. In the world of the extraordinary spread of IT technologies, including AI, the biosocial basis of life is changing, transforming the anthropological characteristics of man, "creating a new anthropological type of man – *Homo digitalis*. By his existence, he asserts a type of passive man who demonstrates a false existence, imitates creativity, substitutes information for knowledge and pseudo-erudition" (Kremen & Ilin, 2021, p. 12).

In this situation, the phenomenon of giftedness becomes relevant, which is an argument in favour of the greatest intellectual, creative power, will and leadership qualities. This raises the question: are the most gifted and creative individuals actually co-opted into the elite, thus giving the elite additional grounds for its exclusive role in society, given the phenomenon of the spread of *homo digitalis*? The answer to this question is primarily related to understanding the nature of giftedness, either as a purely individual human property or as a more complexly organised intersubjective phenomenon.

Purpose

The review identified the phenomenon of giftedness as the purpose of the study in the context of the dynamics of changing values and meanings of life, which led to the establishment of a new type of person – the digital person (*homo digitalis*). In contemporary philosophical discourse, the concept of "digital" is used quite widely and goes beyond digital technologies, focusing on the transformation of the value-anthropological and cultural-anthropological place of technology in the process of the information and digital revolution. As a result, the purpose is to solve the following tasks step by step: 1) to analyse the conceptual content of the phenomena of giftedness and creativity in the discourse of philosophical anthropology and social philosophy; 2) to identify the theoretical and methodological foundations for analysing the activities of the "digital person" in the context of the transformation of the values of human life and culture; 3) to explicate the main parameters of the intersubjective nature of giftedness in the context of the formation of a creative personality within the scope of educational practices.

Statement of basic materials

The problem of giftedness and its development raised by philosophers, artists, and psychologists throughout the history of culture, has been addressed in different ways, which is quite natural given the complexity of this phenomenon. Psychologists studying this issue are trying to invent testing methods to measure intelligence or certain abilities. Parents mostly rely on the specifics of their children's behaviour. Teachers and practitioners in educational institutions use observation to determine which students are more gifted or have greater abilities in a particular subject in order to offer appropriate curricula. Their decisions and relationships with students have a significant impact on the fate of those they identify as gifted. Scientists who study the phenomenon of giftedness point to a fairly wide range of personal characteristics of giftedness, early or potential giftedness, and note the multifactorial nature of giftedness development.

Usually, giftedness is understood as an individual quality inherent in a person. Therefore, the main scenario of public attitudes towards giftedness is focused on identifying people with special abilities, supporting their productive development (creating an optimal developmental environment), ensuring their optimal socialisation and social success (i.e. the most effective activities for the common good). An integral part of this scenario is the care of those conditions of human existence and personal development that can provide the most favourable conditions for the development of individuals' abilities and talents.

This optic of understanding the problems of giftedness development seems self-evident and does not raise any particular objections. However, in fact, it contains several important theoretical flaws that significantly change the meaning of giftedness and the nature of this phenomenon. The validity of this criticism is evidenced by several basic conceptualisations inherent in the above traditional image of giftedness.

Firstly, giftedness is understood as a certain defined quality, a specific *property of a person* (his or her mind, will, cognition, character, sensuality, creativity, etc.). But not everyone has these qualities, many lack them. The idea of aptitude, abilities – or innate qualities – demonstrates this view most clearly. Secondly, giftedness is assessed as an unquestionably *positive quality*, a desirable, wished-for characteristic of a person. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that giftedness, like talent, creates situational difficulties and problems for the person who has it. With a few exceptions that may be inherent in a person as an individual quality, giftedness is an unconditionally positive human characteristic. In other words, the result of developed gift-

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

edness is a serious intellectual and social asset that strengthens a person's social status and creates prospects for a more productive, more fulfilling life. Thirdly, favourable *external conditions* (family, social, national and cultural, etc.) contribute to the development of giftedness, which largely depends on them. Thus, the issue of giftedness is transferred to the plane of "personality-environment" relations.

In this situation, the digital space is defined as a new information and digital environment of human existence. In this space, the traditional life and thinking of a modern person is changing, and he or she is comfortably settled in the digital space of simulacra, separated from the real world. Digital culture networks "gently imprison" people. The bonus of this "imprisonment", according to M. Kul'taieva (2020), is a shift from "written culture to the culture of images and oral communication, simplification of grammatical rules and syntactic structures through coding such as 'like/dislike'. As a result, the functional significance of likes is increasing, slowing down self-control and blinding consciousness" (authors' transl.) (p. 12).

Information and digital networks are a medium of "radical democratic pluralism" that creates parallel communication spaces dominated by phatic communication, and human relations with the environment are characterised by "friend/enemy thinking" towards those who demonstrate a different position (Reckwitz, 2017, p. 269). Communication and information exchange on social media mostly turns into "phatic communication" – empty talk, presentism, and exchange of insignificant messages.

The emergence of the "digital man" (*homo digitalis*) is a kind of opposition to the type of man previously formed by philosophical anthropology, which is qualitatively different from *homo digitalis* – the modern image of a person who has compensated for his/her capabilities. However, despite the transformational efforts, he or she has gained the status of a person who is "constantly on the move", whose life is programmed and realised by the touch of a finger on a tablet or smartphone screen. A digital person has nothing to do with giftedness and creativity. The everyday life of *homo digitalis* is manifested in its constant self-presentation within the boundaries (primarily on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram), where self-knowledge and self-creation are replaced by selfies. Given this circumstance, H. U. Gumbrecht (2019) believes that a "philosophy of the selfie" is being established within digital culture (p. 42). And this is not the philosophy of a creative, active, engaged person, but the philosophy of an existence that wants to appear better than the obvious. *Homo digitalis* loses the sense of reality, as well as the difference between the process of creation and its imitation, information about it, while awareness of the difference is essential for drawing a line between real creativity and its imitation. The information space of the network, which legitimises the life world of *homo digitalis*, is full of spectacle – advertising, rumours, gossip, quasi-sensations, etc. – instead of content. It is a communication environment for the poorly educated, full of high self-esteem and disrespect for others. The poorly educated person of the information and digital reality does not compare himself or herself with examples of education of the past and does not demonstrate his or her erudition and essence, which is situationally replaced by diplomas and certificates that are essentially demonstrative.

Homo digitalis as a new – template – person no longer shows his or her awareness, as he or she is primarily focused on his or her identity, demonstrating active "narcissism" by using various computer programs and platforms (Spitzer, 2014). The better the gadget and the ability to use a digital gadget, the higher such a person is above all others, especially those who have remained behind the threshold of the new information and digital reality. On the other hand, the anthropological status of such a person, which characterises belonging to information and digital

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

technologies, is moving away from *homo sapience* and, given the challenges of our time, the answer to which requires creativity and a creative approach, not for the better.

Given these characteristics of a new type of person – *homo digitalis* – it is necessary to determine the place and status of giftedness, the phenomenon of which remains an important factor in the formation of a creative, knowledgeable, intellectually developed personality. From the standpoint of this approach, it is advisable to distinguish, according to S. V. Proleiev, a number of conceptualisations that contain both prospects for creative development and theoretical limitations of the actual understanding of giftedness in the situation of the intensive spread of digital culture as an environment for the formation and affirmation of *homo digitalis*.

First. Giftedness is not a purely individual ability, but is the result of social and cultural development. That is, the phenomenon has an intersubjective rather than subjective nature. If we are talking about children's giftedness, who is its bearer – a child or *childhood*, an individual or a *state*, a person or *age*? Is it the individual who is gifted, capable, or is it *society* that contributes to the general progress? Finally, what is the essence of giftedness itself – in an individual capacity, or an *organisationally created system*, a theoretical practice to which individuals are only involved as its effective participants? The answer to the first question leads back to the phenomenon of *anthropological types* with very high giftedness potential, and therefore

The cultural matrix of perception and use of giftedness should take the form of optimal use of these states. A positive answer to the second question requires thinking, first of all, not of a person, but of society – to see in the social system and the whole totality of life forms (in the life world) the real phenomenon of giftedness or its absence. Accordingly, individuals with their specific qualities are epiphenomena derived from the totality of life and society. A positive solution to the third question requires seeing giftedness as a kind of cultural machine of a completely impersonal nature. It is a certain system of action and communication, interaction and value preferences. The definition of giftedness is encoded in cultural practices; giftedness is not a distracted property, it is characterised by cultural (even cultural-historical) relation. (authors' transl.) (Proleiev, 2011, p. 154)

Therefore, it is quite reasonable to believe that the basis, the foundation of giftedness is not an individual, but a complexly organised value-based, communicative and interactive cultural programme and the corresponding "value-sense universe" (S. Krymsky).

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Second. As a rule, giftedness is not a real, existing characteristic. As a rule, it exists in a situation of potentiality – as a *possibility*, not as something real. In this situation, giftedness shows its combination with creativity. Likewise, creativity is not an innate property of an individual and is considered a quality that can be formed through special educational conditions. Creativity (the creation of new things) is set by internal (the need for self-realisation) and external (social and material) conditions. "The main of these conditions are personal development, motivation for creative activity and freedom of individuality" (Tkachenko, 2014, pp. 34-35). Thus, giftedness has the nature of creative capabilities. Only when analysing a real creative product can we talk about giftedness, and

Not just about a specific skill or ability, no matter how useful or valuable they may be in themselves. The existence of giftedness as a potentiality is also a fundamental point for its specific carrier, who, precisely because of its potential nature, for the first time ceases to be only a 'carrier' of a property, but turns into a *person* (personality) that has a *constitutive meaning* for giftedness. For the way of being of giftedness, the only available form of actual reality is an *act of creativity*. (authors' transl.)

(Proleiev, 2011, p. 155)

But can creativity be carried out in a situation where the active driver of the socio-cultural process caused by the information and digital reality is the combination with formalisation, which co-exist not in the dimensions of unity and opposition, but as commensurate processes (Türcke, 2019, pp. 40-42)?

In the information and digital space, there is no social or class differentiation; the dissatisfaction and ambitions of the masses are transformed into the joy of knowing about secular news figures, politicians, oligarchs and even criminal authorities. According to Precht, in the past, people planned for the future, determining their destiny. Nowadays, they try to develop "lateral vision" by "digitally glaring at others", looking for "confirmation of their existence on Google" (Precht, 2020, p. 5). Let us add: not in creativity.

Third. As a rule, giftedness inherently implies creativity, the way in which it is realised in every social culture and political system is through *conflict*. Giftedness, with its potential for creativity (and therefore unpredictability), is a danger to everything that is established and existing. The socio-cultural and political environment is usually concerned not with the utopian problem of "the best life" or "the development of all essential human powers", but with

The universal desire for *self-reproduction*. Giftedness as such (in the form of pure creativity potential) does not contribute to this constant ori-

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

entation of social life, but rather hinders it. Therefore, in an established social system, giftedness is doomed to conflict with the existing and conventional foundations of existence (knowledge, grades, success, etc.). This requires thinking of giftedness not as a positive asset, but as a fundamental and inevitable conflict, including the internal conflict of the individual with himself or herself. (authors' transl.) (Proleiev, 2011, pp. 155-156)

But can such a conflict take place in a situation where a person who cannot imagine himself or herself without information technology is trying to understand his or her perception and ways of thinking and cognition, asserting his or her originality from what mass culture produces? The image of the genius personality that attracted attention in the classical Modern era is increasingly receding into "museums and libraries" (Kultaieva, 2020).

However, in this situation, human evolution does not end with the digital type or image. Knowledge and creativity, which are now and will continue to be actively produced by the intellect, cannot and will not be focused on undeveloped individuals whose top achievements are measured in terms of the quality of the gadget's video camera and the number of likes. Human progress has always been and remains dependent on those individuals who are characterised by intelligence, creativity, and innovation. While the information, communication, economic and technological process is in constant dynamics of its forms, the mental, archetypal, intellectual and knowledge foundations of civilisation are focused on the use of the enormous potential of giftedness as a spiritual and cultural essence of a person and its further productive development.

Originality

It is substantiated that the process of human evolution is conditioned by the development of intelligence and creativity, the influence of which forms a certain anthropological image of a person, whose features are determined by giftedness. The homo digitalis generated by the information and computer network, as a result of changes in its cognitive abilities, sensory perception and perception of the world, demonstrates alienation from productive thinking, creativity and axiological imperatives. Formation of a more advanced anthropological type of human in the context of further progress in education, science and culture is a complex process of social support and development of talent, intelligence and creativity.

Conclusions

An important role in the formation of a specific anthropological type of person is played by the phenomenon of giftedness, which goes beyond the individual and asserts itself in the parameters of sociality and its cultural determinations. Giftedness is a factor that determines the development of science, culture, knowledge, as well as the main characteristics of a civilised person. At the same time, each epoch in the civilizational progress demonstrates a characteristic type of

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

person with certain anthropological characteristics. They are formed and affirmed as a result of the development of culture, the influence of which gives rise to a religious person, a metaphysical person, an economic person, a technological person, etc. Today, information and digital technologies, which have confidently entered the life of all mankind, have accelerated positive changes in society, enhanced human creativity through the capabilities of the Internet and innovative media products. But at the same time, the comprehensive impact of information technologies, due to their cultivation and accessibility, on culture and humanity as a whole constitutes the emergence of a digital society that gives rise to a new anthropological type of human being – homo digitalis. It essentially affirms the type of passive human being who demonstrates inauthentic existence, imitates creativity, replaces knowledge with information, and focuses on self-presentation. In this aspect, a digital person is the result of a digital culture. However, despite the serious challenge of society to the further civilisational progress of mankind, philosophical and anthropological discourse proves that a society based on education focused on the development of talent, an educational environment where the cultivation of knowledge and creativity prevails, can create a person capable of living and working in the dynamics of technological and socio-cultural progressive transformations.

REFERENCES

- Capurro, R. (2017). *Homo digitalis: Beiträge zur Ontologie, Anthropologie und Ethik der digitalen Technik*. Springer. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-17131-5> (in German)
- Gumbrecht, H. U. (2019). *Brüchige Gegenwart. Reflexionen und Reaktionen*. Stuttgart: Reclam. (in German)
- Husserl, E. (1970). *Philosophie der Arithmetik: Mit Ergänzenden Texten (1890-1901)*. Springer. (in German)
- Kremen, V. H., & Ilin, V. V. (2021). Transformation of the Human Image in the Paradigm of Knowledge Evolution. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (19), 5-14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i19.235953> (in English)
- Kultaieva, M. (2020). Homo Digitalis, Digital culture and Digital Education: Explorations of Philosophical Anthropology and of Philosophy of Education. *Filosofiya Osvity. Philosophy of Education*, 26(1), 8-36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31874/2309-1606-2020-26-1-1> (in Ukrainian)
- Precht, R. D. (2020). *Künstliche Intelligenz und der Sinn des Lebens*. München: Goldmann Verlag. (in German)
- Proleiev, S. V. (2011). Elita yak chynnyk samoorhanizatsii sotsiumu. In *Elita: vytoky, sutnist, perspektyvy* (pp. 127-164). Kyiv: Znannia Ukrainy. (in Ukrainian)
- Reckwitz, A. (2017). *Die Gesellschaft der Singularitäten: Zum Strukturwandel der Moderne*. Suhrkamp. (in German)
- Schwab, K., & Davis, N. (2018). *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution: A Guide to Building a Better World*. London: Penguin Random House. (in English)
- Spitzer, M. (2014). *Digitale Demenz: Wie wir uns und unsere Kinder um den Verstand bringen*. München: Droemer Knaur Verlag. (in German)
- Tkachenko, L. I. (2014). Kreatyvnist i tvorchist: suchasnyi kontent. *Osvita ta rozvytok obdarovanoi osobystosti*, (9-10), 32-35. (in Ukrainian)
- Türcke, C. (2019). *Digitale Gefolgschaft: Auf dem Weg in eine neue Stammesgesellschaft*. München: C.H. Beck. (in German)
- Zichy, M. (2017). *Menschenbilder: Eine Grundlegung*. Verlag Karl Alber. (in German)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Capurro R. *Homo digitalis: Beiträge zur Ontologie, Anthropologie und Ethik der digitalen Technik*. Springer, 2017. 209 s. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-17131-5>
- Gumbrecht H. U. *Brüchige Gegenwart. Reflexionen und Reaktionen*. Stuttgart : Reclam, 2019. 128 s.
- Husserl E. *Philosophie der Arithmetik: Mit Ergänzenden Texten (1890-1901)*. Springer, 1970. 616 s.
- Kremen V. H., Ilin V. V. Transformation of the Human Image in the Paradigm of Knowledge Evolution. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2021. No. 19. P. 5–14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i19.235953>

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Култаєва М. Homo digitalis, дигітальна культура і дигітальна освіта: філософсько-антропологічні і філософсько-освітні розвідки. *Філософія освіти. Philosophy of Education*. 2020. Т. 26, № 1. С. 8–36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31874/2309-1606-2020-26-1-1>
- Precht R. D. *Künstliche Intelligenz und der Sinn des Lebens*. München : Goldmann Verlag, 2020. 256 s.
- Пролеєв С. В. Еліта як чинник самоорганізації соціуму. *Еліта: витоки, сутність, перспективи*. Київ : Знання України, 2011. С. 127–164.
- Reckwitz A. *Die Gesellschaft der Singularitäten: Zum Strukturwandel der Moderne*. Suhrkamp, 2017. 480 s.
- Schwab K., Davis N. *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution: A Guide to Building a Better World*. London : Penguin Random House, 2018. 273 p.
- Spitzer M. *Digitale Demenz: Wie wir uns und unsere Kinder um den Verstand bringen*. München : Droemer Knaur Verlag, 2014. 368 s.
- Ткаченко Л. І. Креативність і творчість: сучасний контент. *Освіта та розвиток обдарованої особистості*. 2014. № 9-10 (28-29). С. 32–35.
- Türcke C. *Digitale Gefolgschaft: Auf dem Weg in eine neue Stammesgesellschaft*. München : C.H. Beck, 2019. 251 s.
- Zichy M. *Menschenbilder: Eine Grundlegung*. Verlag Karl Alber, 2017. 464 s.

Л. І. ТКАЧЕНКО^{1*}, А. А. ІЛЬІНА^{2*}

^{1*} Інститут обдарованої дитини Національної академії педагогічних наук України (Київ, Україна), ел. пошта Tkachenko.Lidiya@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-2303-1147

^{2*} Інститут педагогіки Національної академії педагогічних наук України (Київ, Україна), ел. пошта aailina@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0001-7260-8398

Обдарованість як чинник конститування людини креативної

Мета. Основу представленого дослідження складає філософсько-антропологічний аналіз проблеми креативності в сучасному освітньому просторі, доповненої інформаційно-цифровою реальністю як підґрунтям зміни цінностей і смислів особистості, що призвело до ствердження людини дигітальної (homo digitalis). Ця обставина, в умовах розуміння необхідності цивілізаційного розвитку, ставить проблему послідовного розв'язання таких завдань: 1) провести огляд і виявити теоретико-методологічне пояснення змісту і сенсу діяльності людини дигітальної (homo digitalis) в умовах трансформації цінностей культури і способів комунікації; 2) здійснити аналіз концептуального змісту феномену обдарованості й виникнення креативності в дискурсі філософської антропології і філософії освіти; 3) провести експлікацію основних параметрів інтерсуб'єктної природи обдарованості в контексті формування креативної особистості. **Теоретичний базис.** Динамічний процес формування нового антропологічного типу людини (homo digitalis) виводить філософію освіти на новий рівень теоретико-філософського осмислення. Філософсько-антропологічний вимір homo digitalis дозволяє визначити перспективи підтримки обдарованості як умови формування і розвитку креативної особистості, як цілісності когнітивного, екзистенційного і метафілософського змісту. Актуальність поставленої проблеми обумовлена кризою аксіологічних сенсів буття людини в ситуації утвердження дигітальної культури, яка в результаті потужного впливу інформаційно-цифрової реальності обумовлює зміну культури спілкування – від писемної культури до культури мемів, що зрештою призводить до ствердження шаблонів і стереотипів поведінки і мислення, які стають перепорою для розвитку обдарованості. **Наукова новизна.** Обґрунтовано, що феномен обдарованості значною мірою визначає стратегію формування активної творчої особистості в умовах цивілізаційних викликів, які постали перед людством і Україною зокрема, прагне прогресивного розвитку, а отже, відкриває нові перспективи розвитку національної ідентичності з урахуванням якісно іншого феномену антропологічного типу людини. **Висновки.** Сучасна епоха демонструє конститування дигітальної культури, яка породжує новий антропологічний тип людини – homo digitalis. Ураховуючи серйозний виклик, що його створює дигітальна культура, філософсько-антропологічний дискурс, орієнтований на цивілізаційний поступ, здатний забезпечити необхідні вектори розвитку. Ствердження концептуальних положень феномену обдарованості й творчості доводить їхній вплив на розвиток освіченості, науковості, креативності як характеристик людини цивілізаційної. Освіта здатна підготувати креативну людину, готову до діяльності й творчості в динаміці технологічних і соціокультурних трансформацій і викликів.

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Ключові слова: людина дигітальна; філософська антропологія; креативність; творчість; культура; цінності; освіта; знання; інтелігентність

Received: 21.02.2025

Accepted: 23.06.2025