

**Неоніла КРИВЦУН,**

аспірант кафедри педагогіки та освітнього менеджменту імені Богдана Ступарика,
Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника (м. Івано-Франківськ, Україна)

Neonila KRYVTSUN,

Postgraduate student at the Department of Pedagogy and Educational Technologies named after B. Stuparyk,
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University (Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine)

neonilakryvtsun@gmail.com

ORCID ID 0000-0002-3619-0083

УДК 37+929(477)

РОЗВИТОК ЗАРУБІЖНОЇ ПЕДАГОГІЧНОЇ ДУМКИ В РЕЦЕПЦІЇ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ НАУКОВЦІВ

Анотація. Актуальність статті зумовлюється потребою осмислення нагромадженого в українській педагогічній науці масиву наукових праць про персоналії, які уособлюють розвиток зарубіжної педагогічної думки. Мета статті полягає в здійсненні синтезованого аналізу досліджень українських компаративістів про носіїв зарубіжної педагогічної думки задля визначення здобутків, вузьких місць і перспектив розвитку історіографії цієї проблеми. У процесі її підготовки використано методи: загальнонаукові (аналіз і синтез, індукція і дедукція, узагальнення і порівняння); міждисциплінарні (історико-генетичний, історико-структурний, ретроспективний); частково-наукові (контент-аналіз, дискурс-аналіз); історіографічні (монографічний, аналізу основного корпусу джерел, аналізу системи знань). Результати дослідження полягають у з'ясуванні значення і впливу на історіографію порушеної проблеми знакових підручників і навчальних посібників М. Гриценка (1973), В. Кравця (1996), І. Зайченка (2010), Д. Скільського (2011); визначенні групи праць методичного спрямування, які призначені для підготовки до лекційних і семінарських занять, організації самостійної роботи та навчально-наукової праці; виявленні тенденції щодо розширення наукового і навчально-методичного контенту з порушеної проблеми завдяки міждисциплінарним студіям з філософії, психології, історії культури та ін.

Проаналізовано процес нарощування нових знань з досліджуваної проблеми, який відображають різновидові науково-аналітичні студії (монографії, дисертації, статті, матеріали конференцій). За підходами до вивчення персоналії як носіїв зарубіжної педагогічної думки їх поділено на дві групи: 1) умовно «просопографічні», які вивчають формальні і неформальні спільноти діячів як представників певних наукових, педагогічних, освітніх течій, напрямів, шкіл; 2) персоналізовані, які зосереджуються на вивченні окремих діячів (біографій).

Ключові слова: зарубіжна педагогічна думка, педагогічна персоналія, педагогічна компаративіста, педагогічна біографістика, історіографія української історико-педагогічної науки, просопографія.

EVOLUTION OF FOREIGN PEDAGOGICAL THOUGHT IN THE RECEPTION OF UKRAINIAN SCIENTISTS

Abstract. The relevance of the article is determined by the need to comprehend the accumulated in the Ukrainian pedagogical science array of scientific works about personalities who personify the development of foreign pedagogical thought. The purpose of the article is to carry out a synthesised analysis of the research of Ukrainian comparativists on the bearers of foreign pedagogical thought in order to identify the achievements, bottlenecks and prospects for the development of the historiography of this problem. In the process of its preparation, the following methods were used: general scientific (analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction, generalisation and comparison); interdisciplinary (historical and genetic, historical and structural, retrospective); partial scientific (content analysis, discourse analysis); historiographical (monographic, analysis of the main body of sources, analysis of the knowledge system). The results of the study are to clarify the significance and influence on the historiography of the problem raised by the landmark textbooks and manuals by M. Hrytsenko (1973), V. Kravets (1996), I. Zaichenko (2010), D. Skilskyi (2011); identifying a group of methodological works intended for preparation for lectures and seminars, organisation of independent work and educational and scientific work); identifying the tendency to expand the scientific and educational content on the problem raised through interdisciplinary studies in philosophy, psychology, cultural history, etc.

The article analyses the process of building up new knowledge on the problem under study, which is reflected in various types of scientific and analytical studies (monographs, dissertations, articles, conference materials). According to the approaches to the study of personalities as carriers of foreign pedagogical thought, they are divided into two groups: 1) conditionally 'prosopographical', which study formal and informal communities of figures as representatives of certain scientific, pedagogical, educational trends, directions, schools; 2) personalised, which focus on the study of individual figures (biographies).

Keywords: foreign pedagogical thought, pedagogical personality, pedagogical comparativist, pedagogical biography, historiography of Ukrainian historical and pedagogical science, prosopography.



INTRODUCTION

The problem formulation. Ukrainian pedagogical science has accumulated a significant body of research on the development of foreign pedagogical thought, which requires analysis and comprehension. In a broad sense, this formulation of the problem refers to the entire body of research by Ukrainian scholars on foreign personalities. Therefore, in this article we present a general description of its two main components – educational literature and scientific and analytical studies, as well as important historiographical features of the problem.

RESEARCH AIM AND TASKS

to carry out a synthesised analysis of the research of Ukrainian comparativists on the carriers of foreign pedagogical thought in order to identify the achievements, bottlenecks and prospects for the development of the historiography of this problem.

RESEARCH METHODS

The following methods were used in the preparation of the study: general scientific (analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction, generalisation and comparison – to determine its logic and content orientation); interdisciplinary (historical-genetic, historical-structural, retrospective - to determine the dynamics, stages, trends of the historiographical process); partially scientific (content analysis, discourse analysis – to study various aspects of the development of foreign pedagogical thought); historiographical (monographic, analysis of the main body of sources, analysis of knowledge systems – for critical analysis of historical and pedagogical literature and individual works).

RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

Despite the predominantly negative attitude to the work of Ukrainian Soviet historical and pedagogical science, it is worth noting the landmark textbook 'History of Pedagogy' edited by M. Hrytsenko, which had a significant impact on the development of its post-Soviet historiography. It is characterised by a high degree of personification, so in modern studies we trace the influence of its authors' characterisations of representatives of pedagogical thought of the Ancient, Renaissance, and Enlightenment periods, in particular, J. A. Comenius, J. Locke, D. Belles, C. A. Helvetius, D. Diderot, J. J. Rousseau, J. G. Pestalozzi, F. A. W. Dysterweg, K. Wander, J. F. Herbert, O. Owen, S. Fourier, A. C. Saint-Simon, and others. Their biographies, main works, core ideas, concepts that define their active role and place in the development of world pedagogical thought are presented in a clearly structured format (Hrytsenko, 1973, pp. 9-70).

These evaluative characteristics apply to two more significant and most cited works by contemporary scholars, 'Foreign School and Pedagogy of the Twentieth Century' and 'History of Classical Foreign Pedagogy and Schooling' (both 1996). They reflect the approaches to the study of world pedagogical thought inherent in the post-Soviet historiographical period of the 1990s. Given the systematic chronological approach and structured format (biographical data; theoretical ideas, views, concepts; educational, methodological, and educational activities, etc.), these works can be called a real 'encyclopedia' of personalities of foreign pedagogical thought. The analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of the work of prominent world teachers presented by the scientist takes these studies beyond the didactic literature and demonstrates their scientific and analytical significance (Kravets, 1996a; Kravets, 1996b).

These features and characteristics to some extent also apply to D. Skilskyi's popular in the scientific and educational environment textbook 'History of Foreign Pedagogy' (2011), which adsorbed methodological approaches to the study of pedagogical personalities abroad during the second historiographical period of 2001-2011. The author's attempts to present their creative ideas and scientific and methodological developments in the context of actualisation of European integration narratives based on interpretations of post-Soviet scientific discourse are evident (Skilskyi, 2011). However, in our opinion, this is also a certain limitation of the work under review, as well as of V. Kravets' work. In both cases, the materials of Soviet and contemporary Ukrainian and Russian authors were articulated, while the work of Western scholars remained virtually unused. This gap in Ukrainian historiography, as we will show below, is filled mainly in dissertations on individual representatives of foreign pedagogical thoughts.

The following works stand out from the refereed works in terms of the format of presentation of the material: 'Essays on the History of the Development of Pedagogical Thought' by S. Sysoiev and I. Sokolova (2003). Each pedagogical personality (including such 'little-known' ones as A. Adler and others) is presented through the prism of a chronology of life: birth, education, appearance of scientific works, educational and social activities, etc. This approach makes sense, as it shows the personality/biography against the background of the era, although it does not always give a clear picture of its role and significance in the development of world pedagogical thought.

Together with another thematically oriented 'History of Foreign Pedagogy' (A. Ratsul et al., 2008), we can outline a gallery of 40-45 pedagogical personalities who, according to the reception developed by Ukrainian scholars, should represent foreign pedagogical thought. According to our analysis, compared to the aforementioned History of Pedagogy of 1973, their list has changed by about 20-25%. Its 'unchanged backbone' is made up of figures of the Renaissance (V. de Feltré, F. Rabelais, T. More, T. Campanella), the New Age (J. A. Comenius, C. A. Helvetius, D. Diderot, J. J. Rousseau, J. G. Pestalozzi, W. Humboldt, A. Dysterwegh, J. F. Herbart, R. Owen, S. Fourier, A. C. Saint-Simon) and a cluster of reformist teachers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which will be discussed below.

The so-called philanthropic educators of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (J. Bazedov, H. G. Saltzman, I. G. Kampe, etc.) constitute the 'second tier' of personalities, which are somewhat less represented in the educational and scientific literature. Ideological, scientific and methodological considerations prompted scholars to adjust the 'pantheon' of foreign personalities. In particular, the representatives of pedagogical thought of the French Revolution of the late eighteenth century (J. A. Condorcet, M. Lepelletier, G. Babeuf) present in Soviet and post-Soviet publications were replaced by figures from North American states, etc.



This trend towards updating and expanding the constellation of representatives of foreign pedagogical thought is reflected in the textbook on the history of pedagogy by I. Zaichenko (Vol. 1; 2010). Compared to the above-mentioned studies, this work is less personalised, as it presents significant factual material on the development of schooling and education abroad. At the same time, it actualises the study of lesser-known personalities by higher education students and the need for substantive scientific research: encyclopaedic scholars of the Arab East (Kindi, Farabi, Biruni, Avicenna, Averroes, Tusi, Ibn Khaldun, etc.); representatives of Byzantine pedagogical thought (Plutarch, Proclus, Porphyry, Edesius of Cappadocia, Ammonius, Damascus, Simplicius, Emperor Justinian, Gregory the Theologian, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, etc.), Jesuit education system (I. Loyola, etc.), European pedagogical thought of the Renaissance and Reformation (B. Lamy, F. Bacon, P. Charron, R. Descartes), the New Age (W. Rathke), the North American states of the Enlightenment (B. Franklin, T. Jefferson, T. Paine), philanthropic educators (J. Bazedova, H. Saltzman, W. Humboldt), etc. We positively evaluate I. Zaichenko's return to the bosom of pedagogical science of the work of Ukrainian scientists of the first third of the twentieth century, who have accumulated significant experience in studying foreign teachers of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Zaichenko, 2010).

Brief descriptions of the life and work of foreign figures in textbooks and manuals on the history of pedagogy and the history of foreign school and pedagogy by O. Meshko, O. Yankovych, H. Meshko (1998), M. Levkivskiy (2004, 2008, 2011), H. Trotsko (2008), T. Zavorodnia, L. Prokopiv, I. Strazhnikova (2014), O. Pronikova (2015), L. Sushchenko, Y. Zubtsova (2020), L. Malyar, M. Kukhta (2020), etc. reflect the professional experience of teaching these disciplines and meet the needs of students in educational and methodological support. In scientific, theoretical and factual terms, they almost do not reflect the process of building new knowledge, but articulate the narratives developed by the national historical and pedagogical scientific community.

Part of this group of works is purely methodological, as it is intended for preparation for lectures and seminars, organisation of independent and educational and scientific work. As examples of systematic and original approaches to solving these problems, we note 'History of Pedagogy in Schemes, Maps, Diagrams' (2015) and 'Workshop on the History of Pedagogy' (2019) by A. Sbruieva and others; 'History of Foreign Pedagogy' by S. Chovrii (2022), etc.

Scientific and educational content on the issue is expanded by interdisciplinary studies in philosophy, psychology, cultural history, etc. For example, let us note the work 'Historical Portraits of Antiquity and the Middle Ages'. Out of the 30 biographies contained in it, about 12-15 are devoted to figures who are considered pedagogical personalities in the above-mentioned works. These essays broaden the understanding and present them as well-rounded intellectuals who contributed to the development of various fields of knowledge (Balukh, Vozniy, Kotsur, 2007).

Collections of documentary materials, in particular, in the form of textbooks on the history of preschool pedagogy (Z. Borysova et al., 1990), on the history of foreign pedagogy (A. Sbruieva, 2006; E. Kovalenko, N. Belkina, 2006), etc. are considered as an important component of the scientific and methodological content of national pedagogy on the problem under discussion. An acceptable format is when they are combined with lecture texts (E. Fedorchuk, 2007), etc.

A characteristic feature and a certain disadvantage of these publications is that most of the materials contained in them are tests borrowed from Ukrainian Soviet publications of the 1920s and later Soviet and modern Russian-language books. They contain virtually no authentic translations of works by foreign teachers. In our observation, such documentary collections have not only didactic but also scientific significance, as they are actively used by researchers in the preparation of analytical studies.

Given the above-mentioned scientific and methodological perspectives, A. Rozsokha's 'Ancient Pedagogy' (2012) deserves to be noted. The author has managed to organically combine a number of important components: educational and methodological (programme of a specialised training course, tests and keys to them, etc.); scientific and cognitive, represented by fragments of historical and pedagogical sources; educational and auxiliary in the form of a dictionary and a chronological table on ancient and world pedagogy, etc. (Rossoha, 2012). This informal approach improves the scientific and methodological level of the literature, making it attractive in cognitive and intellectual terms.

The process of accumulating new knowledge is reflected in various types of scientific and analytical studies (monographs, dissertations, articles, conference materials). According to the approaches to the study of personalities as carriers of foreign pedagogical thought, they can be divided into two groups: 1) conditionally 'prosopographical', which study formal and informal communities of figures as representatives of certain scientific, pedagogical, educational trends, directions, schools; 2) personalised, which focus on the study of individual figures (biographies).

As an example of the first group of works, we note the thorough research of L. Vakhovskiy, L. Murmurash, I. Tsebrii and others on representatives of foreign pedagogical thought of the Ancient World and the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the Enlightenment. Although the component of biography is poorly represented in these studies, they comprehensively reflect the common, general and special features that each figure brought to the development of humanistic pedagogy and the implementation of its ideas in the organisation of schooling and the development of the educational process.

Both of the above-mentioned research groups are reflected by the array of works on representatives of various currents, directions, and schools of reform pedagogy of the end of the 19th - the first third of the 20th centuries: free education, humanistic pedagogy, child-centrism - K. Wentzel, H. Vineken, O. Dekroli, Ya. Korchak, M. Montessori, O. Nill, S. Frene (O. Barilo, S. Belova, S. Vdovich, H. Kemin, O. Kvas, I. Dychkivska, S. Kurkina, A. Rastrygina, O. Sukhomlynska, T. Petrova and others); of experimental and pragmatic pedagogy - J. Dewey, V. A. Lai, E. Mayman, E. Thorndike, S. Hall and others. (L. Veremyuk, V. Kovalenko, N. Kravtsova, L. Lysenko, O. Radionova); R. Steiner's Waldorf pedagogy (S. Gozak, O. Ionova, S. Luparenko, L. Lytvyn, O. Lukashenko, V. Novoselska, V. Partola, etc.); G. Kershensteiner's labor school and civic education (T. Tokareva, V. Tyagur, etc.).



The array of personalised works reflects two important vectors of the historiography of the problem under study: 1) chronological, which shows the focus of research on the figures of the Renaissance (XV - XVI centuries), the Enlightenment (second half of the XVII - XVIII centuries), especially the reformist pedagogy of the late nineteenth - first third of the twentieth century and to a lesser extent on teachers of the second half of the twentieth - early twenty-first century; 2) country studies - indicates the focus of scholars on the study of the carriers of pedagogical thought in Western Europe and the United States.

Personalised studies reflect the accumulation of new knowledge due to the introduction into the scientific circulation of Ukrainian biographical comparative studies of the names of little-known and/or poorly researched figures such as Al-Farabi (A. Al-Sammarai), M. Gandhi, Ch. Dickens, R. Tagore (V. Vasylenko), H. Mann (M. Vakhovskiy), E. Ryerson (L. Huk), L. Gurlit (E. Demyda), N. L. Zinzendorf (V. Zavalniuk), P. Peter Zavalniuk, P. Petersen (B. Erzhbekova, B. Skomorovskiy), E. Klapared, B. Russell (O. Kerik, M. Klim), J. Tolkien (Y. Labunets), E.-O. O. Chartier (M. Martianova), H. Parkhurst (M. Petrechko), L. Malagusi (L. Platash), K. Denek (O. Zakharova), T. Gordon (S. Isaieva), N. F. S. Gruntvig (N. Shuhalii), and others.

Finally, we should mention a fairly large group of studies prepared in the spirit of biographical comparativism that compare the pedagogical systems of foreign personalities or certain aspects of their work. They have different content perspectives, as they compare the ideas of figures who lived in different countries at the same time, for example, J. Korchak, on the one hand, and A. Makarenko (Y. Hoyda) and O. Sukhomlynskyi (S. Denysiuk), on the other; represented different eras and educational systems - J. Comenius and Confucius (M. Alatarenko); had common and special views on certain educational and pedagogical problems - H. Mann and K. Ushynskiy (M. Vakhovskiy), S. Rusova and O. Decroli (O. Dvornik), J. Dewey, R. Steiner and K. Ushynskiy, V. Sukhomlynskyi (N. Dichek, O. Ionova, L. Lytvyn), M. Montessori and V. Sukhomlynskyi (M. Kargapolitseva), J. Decroli and S. Fr̄ny (O. Karamanov), J. Comenius and V. Sukhomlynskyi (K. Mazur), etc. These studies reflect the degree of methodological culture of Ukrainian scholars, as they produce a qualitatively new level of analysis, highlighting the diversity of personalised ideas, views, concepts at different stages of development of foreign and domestic pedagogical thought.

CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

Consequently, the Ukrainian historical and pedagogical science has accumulated a significant array of various works on personalities representing the development of foreign pedagogical thought. Ukrainian Soviet historiography had a certain influence on this process. Overall, the field of study of Ukrainian scholars includes about 45-50 such figures, mainly from among the famous educators of the Enlightenment and representatives of reformist pedagogy of the late nineteenth and first third of the twentieth century. The introduction of new foreign personalities into the subject field of national pedagogy is slow, mostly due to individual articles and dissertations. Prospects for further research are seen in the study of the work of Ukrainian scholars on prominent representatives of foreign philosophy of education.

REFERENCES

- Balukh, V. O., Voznyi, I. P., Kotsur, V. P. (2007). Historical portraits of antiquity and the Middle Ages: a textbook. Chernivtsi: Books – XXI [in Ukrainian].
- Hrytsenko, M. S. (1973). History of pedagogy. Kyiv: Books [in Ukrainian].
- Kravets, V. P. (1996a). Foreign school and pedagogy of the 20th century. Ternopil, 1996 [in Ukrainian].
- Kravets, V. P. (1996b). History of classical foreign pedagogy and schooling: education. Ternopil [in Ukrainian].
- Ratsul, A. B., Radul, O. S., Ratsul, O. A. (2008). History of foreign pedagogy: education. Kirovohrad: KDNU im. V. Vynnychenka [in Ukrainian].
- Rozsokha, A. P. (2012). Ancient pedagogy. Pereiaslav-Khmelnyskyi [in Ukrainian].
- Skilskyi, D. (2011). History of foreign pedagogy. Kyiv: Torch [in Ukrainian].
- Sysoieva, S. O., Sokolova, I. V. (2003). Essays on the history of the development of pedagogical thought. Kyiv: Center for educational literature [in Ukrainian].
- Zaichenko, I. V. (2010). History of pedagogy: navch. posib. u 2 kn. Kn. I: History of foreign pedagogy. Kyiv: Word [in Ukrainian].

Received

02.05.2024

Accepted

23.05.2024