

**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)

КОМПАРАТИВІСТСЬКО-ПЕРСОНІФІКОВАНІ СТУДІЇ ПРО ДІЯЧІВ ПЕДАГОГІЧНОГО РЕФОРМАТОРСЬКОГО РУХУ КІНЦЯ ХІХ – ПЕРШОЇ ТРЕТИНИ ХХ СТ.

Анотація. У статті здійснено предметний порівняльний аналіз понад двох десятків виявлених різновидових компаративістсько-персоніфкованих праць (монографії, дисертації, наукові статті, матеріали наукових конференцій) про діячів педагогіки реформ кінця ХІХ – першої третини ХХ ст. Визначено науково-теоретичну і практичну цінність цього доробку для розвитку вітчизняної педагогіки та освіти.

Показано, що науковці не завжди зважали на методологічні установки і вимоги до підготовки означеної групи студій, які стосуються часових періодів, інших ознак, критеріїв зіставлення. Виявлено вузьке коло персоналій, що стали предметом таких досліджень. Переважно це були знані зарубіжні постаті – Дж. Дьюї, Я. Корчак, М. Монтессорі Р. Штайнер, з одного боку, та знакові представники української педагогічної думки – А. Макаренко, С. Русова, В. Сухомлинський, з іншого. Менш привабливими для вивчення є діади зарубіжних діячів як достатньо знаних (Ж. Декролі – С. Френе), так і менш відомих (Ален – О. Ребул) в українській педагогічній науці.

На конкретних прикладах схарактеризовано два умовно визначені методологічні підходи підготовки означеної групи студій. Перший – «дзеркальний-порівняльний» – передбачає уподібнення різних аспектів біографій і педагогічних систем (почергове виявлення подібних та відмінних елементів біографій, авторських систем, окремих ідей і поглядів). Другий – «паралельний» – підхід орієнтує на комплексний цілісний розгляд спершу однієї, потім другої педагогічних персоналій, відтак порівняльний аналіз їх біографій та педагогічних ідей. Визначено переваги та обмеження кожного підходу, а також перспективність підготовки студій, у яких порівнюються погляди не двох, як зазвичай, а трьох і більше педагогів

Узагальнено науково-теоретичне і дидактичне значення таких розвідок для розвитку педагогічної історіографії та освітнього процесу України.

Ключові слова: історіографія української педагогічної науки, педагогічна біографістика, педагогічна персоналія, зарубіжний педагогічний реформаторський рух кінця ХІХ – першої третини ХХ ст., історіографічне джерело.

COMPARATIVE AND PERSONALISED STUDIES OF THE FIGURES OF THE PEDAGOGICAL REFORM MOVEMENT OF THE LATE 19TH AND FIRST THIRD OF THE 20TH CENTURIES

Abstract. The article carries out a substantive comparative analysis of more than two dozen identified varieties of comparative and personalised works (monographs, dissertations, scientific articles, materials of scientific conferences) on the figures of reform pedagogy of the late nineteenth - first third of the twentieth century. The scientific, theoretical and practical value of this work for the development of national pedagogy and education is determined.

It is shown that scholars did not always take into account the methodological guidelines and requirements for the preparation of this group of studies, which relate to time periods, other features, and comparison criteria. A narrow circle of personalities has been identified as the subject of such studies. These were mainly well-known foreign figures - J. Dewey, Y. Korchak, M. Montessori, R. Steiner, on the one hand, and significant representatives of Ukrainian pedagogical thought - A. Makarenko, S. Rusova, V. Sukhomlynskyi, on the other. Less attractive for study were the dyads of foreign figures, both well-known (J. Decroli - S. Frenet) and less well-known (Alain - O. Reboul) in Ukrainian pedagogical science.

Two conditionally defined methodological approaches to the preparation of this group of studies are characterised using specific examples. The first one, «mirror-comparative», involves comparing different aspects of biographies and pedagogical systems (identifying similar and different elements of biographies, authorial systems, individual ideas and views in turn). The second «parallel» approach focuses on a comprehensive holistic consideration of first one, then the other pedagogical personality, and then a comparative analysis of their biographies and pedagogical ideas. The advantages and limitations of each approach are determined, as well as the prospects for preparing studies that compare the views of three or more teachers rather than two, as usual.



The scientific, theoretical and didactic significance of such studies for the development of pedagogical historiography and the educational process of Ukraine is summarised.

Keywords: historiography of Ukrainian pedagogical science, pedagogical biography, pedagogical personality, foreign pedagogical reform movement of the late XIX - first third of the XX century, historiographical source.

INTRODUCTION

The problem formulation. The historiography of Ukrainian pedagogical science has accumulated a significant body of research on the representatives of reformist pedagogy of the late XIX – early XX centuries. We distinguish a separate group of works that present a comparative analysis of their biographies and pedagogical views, author's systems with relevant aspects of the life of other prominent figures from abroad and Ukraine. The special subject matter of this study is of scientific relevance and practical significance for the development of national education and pedagogy, as it expands the understanding of pedagogical ideas, methods, technologies that are interesting and productive for the organisation of the educational process and paves the way for another direction of integration into the European educational space and scientific discourse.

Analysis of recent research. Since this article involves a direct consideration of the works of contemporary Ukrainian scholars on the raised issue, we note that there are actually only two comprehensive studies on the historiography of Montessori pedagogy (O. Storonska, 2013) and reformist pedagogy of the late XIX – early XX centuries (Y. Chopyk, 2016). However, in these or other works, there was no substantive holistic analysis of the relatively separate and original group of studies we have identified.

RESEARCH AIM AND TASKS

The purpose of the article is to carry out a substantive comparative analysis of comparative and personalised works on the figures of reform pedagogy of the late XIX – first third of the XX century in order to determine the scientific, theoretical and practical value of this work for the development of national pedagogy and education.

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

More than two dozen different types of historiographical sources (monographs, dissertations, scientific articles, etc.) of a comparative and personalised orientation have been identified, which compare the life and work of representatives of the reform movement of the late XIX – first third of the XX century and well-known teachers, cultural and educational figures of Ukraine and the world of different eras. The representative studies presented in Table 1 show that the choice of personalities for comparison was primarily determined by the similarity of their pedagogical ideas and views. At the same time, scholars did not always take into account the methodological guidelines and requirements for the preparation of such studies, which relate to time periods and other features and criteria. We also see a rather narrow range of personalities who have been the subject of such studies. On the one hand, these were mostly well-known foreign figures – J. Dewey, V. Korchak, M. Montessori, R. Steiner and prominent representatives of Ukrainian pedagogical thought, on the other – A. Makarenko, S. Rusova, V. Sukhomlynskyi. The dyads of foreign figures, both well-known (J. Decroli – S. Frenet) and lesser-known (Alain – O. Reboul) in Ukrainian pedagogical science, proved to be less attractive for study.

Table 1

Representative comparative and personalised works on pedagogical personalities of foreign countries and Ukraine [author's elaboration]

| Author | Teaching staff | Problem, subject matter |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| N. Abashkina | A. Makarenko – H. Kershenshteiner | Vocational training in educational institutions |
| I. Boichevska L. Veremliuk T. Kochubei | V. Lai – K. Ushynskyi | Mental, physical, spiritual development of students; the principle of natural correspondence |
| V. Vorozhbit V. Smetanina | V. Korchak – V. Sukhomlynskyi | Individual approach to a gifted child |
| Y. Haida* | Y. Korchak – A. Makarenko | Humanistic education of the individual in the pedagogical heritage |
| A. Haratyk | Y. Korchak – V. Sukhomlynskyi | Ideas of pedocentrism |
| S. Denysiuk | V. Korchak – V. Sukhomlynskyi | Ideas of humanism |
| T. Dovha | Y. Korchak – V. Sukhomlynskyi | Valeopedagogical ideas |
| O. Ionova | R. Steiner – K. Ushynskyi | Pedagogical views |



| | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| O. Ionova | R. Steiner – V. Sukhomlynskyi | Pedagogical views |
| O. Karamanov | J. Decroli – S. Frenet | Creative ideas in the context of organising museum communication |
| M. Kargapoltseva | M. Montessori – V. Sukhomlynskyi | Pedagogy of responsibility |
| V. Kovalenko | J. Dewey – A. Makarenka | Education of students |
| V. Kovalenko | J. Dewey – S. Rusova | Pedagogical views |
| V. Kushnir | Y. Korchak – V. Sukhomlynskyi | Humanistic pedagogy |
| L. Lytvyn | R. Steiner – V. Sukhomlynskyi | Theories of free personality development |
| V. Morhu | Y. Korchak – A. Makarenko | Features of pedagogical humanism |
| M. Martianova | Alain – O. Rebul | Pedagogical concepts |
| H. Milenina* | M. Montessori – S. Rusova | Pedagogical ideas |
| A. Stepanenko | E. Meiman – V. Lai | The concept of experimental pedagogy |
| I. Surzhykova* | S. Frenet – V. Sukhomlynskyi | Pedagogical ideas |
| O. Sukhomlynska | S. Frenet – V. Sukhomlynskyi | Views on education |
| A. Chernii V. Dolid | R. Steiner – V. Sukhomlynskyi | Pedagogical views |

* *Authors of dissertations and monographs*

Given the wide range of topics covered by these studies, we follow the logic of analysing them from the «general» to the «specific» and «particular».

The subject of comprehensive studies was the pedagogical ideas and authorial systems of prominent figures from abroad and Ukraine who lived in approximately the same periods, so their views were formed under the influence of certain ideological trends, but in different social conditions of Western democracy and Soviet totalitarianism. In this vein, we would like to mention the dissertation by I. Surzhykova (2003), who, having carried out a systematic comparative analysis of the stages of life and scientific biographies of S. Frenet and V. Sukhomlynskyi, revealed similar philosophical and social foundations for the formation of their pedagogical worldview, geography and ways of spreading ideas, etc. The researcher has shown that despite living in different state and political systems, they had a lot in common - from social background, family upbringing, working conditions at school, civic activism to support from their wives and a wide circle of followers. Despite their similar understanding of the role of the social environment in the formation of a child's personality, their philosophical credo differed. From these perspectives, the common and special in the scientific systems of the figures is revealed by certain features (goals of education; the role of work in this process; principles and approaches to moral, civic, aesthetic, physical education; the role of parents, etc.) and the components of their pedagogical technologies are structured and compared (Surzhykova, 2003).

In contrast to the aforementioned mirror image of various aspects of the biographies and pedagogical systems of the personalities, H. Milenina tested a «parallel» approach to the comparative analysis of the pedagogical ideas of S. Rusova and M. Montessori. The author alternately highlighted the life paths of one and the other figures, then characterised their concepts of national education and the system of education and personal development. On this basis, the «common and different» in the author's pedagogical systems will be revealed and their components will be actualised in the modern educational process (Milenina, 2015).

Each of these approaches has its advantages and limitations. In our opinion, the first «mirror-comparative» approach is somewhat more productive, as it allows us to emphasise and show the commonalities, especially in the life stories of the studied personalities and the formation of their views and individual components of their pedagogical systems. An important advantage of the «parallel» approach is the possibility of a holistic presentation and comparison of the pedagogical ideas of scientists, abstracting from their «secondary» aspects.

In contrast to the two referenced works, the Polish researcher Y. Haida in her dissertation defended in Ukraine did not resort to a detailed comparison of the biographies of Y. Korchak and A. Makarenko, but identified three similar periods of their formation as humanist teachers (childhood; choice of life path, beginning of pedagogical work, formation of ideological views; testing and improvement of pedagogical systems). Having analysed more than 150 works by Polish and Ukrainian figures, the author has shown the similarity of their educational systems, which were based on the principles of dynamism, openness, self-organisation and reflected a similar understanding of the principles of democracy and self-management of the functioning of the team, the priorities of developing individual capabilities and self-actualisation of the child; approaches to the organisation of production and economic activity, etc. In general, we can also agree with the identified analogues regarding the functioning of children's institutions created by teachers and their understanding of the problem of pedagogical skills (Haida, 2004). Focusing on identifying the «similarities», the researcher did not pay due attention to the differences in the views of the studied personalities. The comparison of the «democratic» and «humanistic» principles of their pedagogical systems is also quite controversial.

In terms of comparison with the above study, we note the works of V. Kushnir, who compared the pedagogical concepts of Y. Korchak and V. Sukhomlynskyi (2004; 2020). Based on the causal and genetic determination of similarities and differences



in biographies (they lived and worked in different periods and social conditions), the author emphasises that the figures belong to the same humanistic direction – «pedagogy of the heart». Based on the analysis of the creative heritage, the author shows the common (understanding of childhood as a holistic system and a self-sufficient period of life; socio-pedagogical support for self-development of the individual; «therapeutic pedagogy») and special (approaches to the ontogeny of the child and the education of «low-ability»; understanding the role of the teacher in the relationship with the child, etc. (Kushnir, 2020).

The content analysis of the dissertations of I. Surzhykova, Y. Haida, and V. Kushnir revealed that when comparing certain personalities, in particular, Y. Korchak and V. Sukhomlynskyi, with other figures from different perspectives, new facets of their authorial systems are revealed, the horizons of understanding these phenomena and their role and significance in the development of pedagogical thought are expanded.

The above also applies to the article materials that reflect certain aspects of the pedagogical systems of the personalities who were the subject of comparative analysis. In particular, we would like to note the discussion paper by V. Morhun with the eloquent title «Paradoxes of Pedagogical Humanism, or How to Love Children According to Anton Makarenko and Yanush Korchak». By comparing their views in the «transcultural educational dialogue,» the author showed that the secret of Makarenko's success, who «imitated Korchak's humanism,» is due to three «secrets»: «All the best for children»; «As much respect and demand for the child as possible»; «Age segregation», when 25-30 peers study under the guidance of teachers «distant in age». Arguing that these features distinguish their «innovative pedagogy from the traditional one», the author proves that despite the different attitudes to Makarenko's figure, his «folk labour pedagogy» has a significant educational potential that is not used in modern educational institutions of Ukraine (Morhun, 2013).

According to our observations, scholars prepare this kind of research from the point of view of comparing the personalities who were the main subject of their research with well-known teachers who have similar scientific views. As an example, let us note the works of the aforementioned researcher of Waldorf pedagogy O. Ionova, who compares the pedagogical views of R. Steiner with the ideas of K. Ushynskyi (Ionova, 1999) and V. Sukhomlynskyi (Ionova, 2004). In the first case, the researcher focused on finding out what is common and special in the anthroposophical views of the figures, which relate to the understanding of the essence of education as a process of comprehensive human development with its needs for self-development, self-actualisation, and realisation of creative potential, which is realised through the internal determinants of social personal growth. These aspects of creativity prompted Steiner and Ushynskyi to align educational tasks with the natural development of the child and to find ways to optimise the educational process to unlock its potential.

According to O. Ionova, the implementation of Waldorf approaches in the national school should be based on our own national experience, in particular the practice of V. Sukhomlynskyi's «School of Gladness». From this perspective, its «spiritual kinship» with the author's system of R. Steiner, who professed the desire for freedom; knowledge of the nature of the child as the goal, the meaning of education; understanding of the age-related peculiarities of personality formation, because for a child the world is first good, then beautiful, and then true, because it is a work of art (Ionova, 2004).

It is interesting to compare this reflection with the study by A. Chernii and V. Dolid, which relays six common features in the approaches to education promoted by V. Sukhomlynskyi and R. Steiner, identified by the Australian scientist A. Cockerill. These are: a view of education as a system of activities aimed at developing the child's intellect, moral and physical qualities; a view of the teacher as a mentor combined with the responsibility of the teaching staff for each child; the need to study each student to support personal development and connections with his or her family; involvement of children in the educational process, particularly in primary school, at the emotional level («sense of wonder») through fairy tales, games, art, physical activity; ensuring the child's relationship with nature as an emphasis on its. The authors illustrate these theses with examples from the work of these teachers (Chernii, & Dolid, 2019). In terms of the discourse on comparing the concepts of R. Steiner and V. Sukhomlynskyi, we should also note the view of L. Lytvyn, who highlighted their new facets through the prism of the theory of free education of the individual (Lytvyn, 2010).

We perceive the scientific and didactic significance of such studies in that they reveal the diversity of views of scholars, including foreign and Ukrainian, on the common and special in the work of prominent teachers and enrich national historiography with such scientific experience.

In this context, let us note the so far rare receptions that compare the pedagogical systems of foreign personalities in their entirety or in certain aspects. As an example, let us note two studies by M. Martianova. The first one draws parallels between the pedagogical views of French educators E.-O. Chartier (Alain) and O. Reboul on the formation of personal attitudes as fundamental skills of students, etc. Their positions on a wide range of issues related to the definition of theoretical approaches and the choice of methods of education and training are revealed (Martianova, 2020).

We should also highlight M. Martianova's research, which compares the views of not two, as usual, but three well-known teachers – S. Frenet, M. Montessori and Alain. Noting their search for ways to improve education and upbringing of the growing generation in accordance with social requirements, the scientist identified the main components of the teacher's activity according to Montessori (creation of a creative environment; ability to interest and observe the work of students, etc.), the main elements of the pedagogical model of Frenet (motivation of interest in learning, etc.) and the essence of Alain's idea of the dual function of education (preparation for present and future difficulties). By comparing these concepts of scientists, the author identified the common principles of learning inherent in them regarding the combination of freedom and discipline, the creation of a favourable environment, the development of mentoring, performance, etc. We believe that this practice of «three-dimensional comparison» makes sense and should be more actively implemented by Ukrainian comparative biographers.

The latter also applies to narrowly thematic studies, such as the research by O. Karamanov, who highlighted the creative ideas of reformist educators J. Decroli and S. Frenet, which are in line with the development of modern museum pedagogy.



According to the author, they are manifested in the organisation of educational communication and the use of elements of museum didactics in the educational process of the school through the involvement of students in creative work in the museum space (Karamanov, 2018).

CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

To sum up, in the accumulated array of various works about the figures of the reformist pedagogical movement of the late XIX – first third of the XX century, a separate original group of studies stands out, which compares their pedagogical ideas and author's systems with the relevant aspects of the creative heritage of other representatives of foreign and Ukrainian pedagogical thought. These publications are of scientific, theoretical, and practical interest in the methodological, content, and other aspects of the development of pedagogical science and the organisation of the educational process, as they expand the understanding of the author's ideas and systems of the studied personalities and identify and design opportunities to use their pedagogical experience to improve the educational process in Ukraine.

We see prospects for further research in the study of other aspects of historiography about the figures of the reform movement, in particular, in the form of works on their collective biographical portraits; personalised studies of their lives and work, and works on individual personalised areas of pedagogical science in the form of Montessori studies, phrenopedagogy, and Steiner pedagogy.

REFERENCES

- Haida, Y. (2004). Problems of humanistic education of the personality in the pedagogical heritage of Janusz Korczak and Anton Makarenko: autoref. thesis ... candidate ped. of science. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
- Ionova, O. M. (1999). Concordance of pedagogical views of K. Ushinsky and R. Steiner. Pedagogy and psychology: collection of scientific articles. Kharkiv: KhDUP, 1, 39–43 [in Ukrainian].
- Ionova, O. M. (2004). Concordance of pedagogical views of R. Steiner and V. Sukhomlynsky. Pedagogy and psychology: collection of scientific articles. Kharkiv: KhDUP, 25, 29–38 [in Ukrainian].
- Karamanov, O. V. (2018). Creative ideas of reformer educators J. O. Decroly and S. Frenet in the context of organizing museum communication. Visn. Lviv. trade-economics. un-tu. Humanities Studies. Lviv, 15, 188–192 [in Ukrainian].
- Kushnir, V. M. (2020). Janusz Korczak and Vasyl Sukhomlynsky: two figures of humanistic pedagogy: monograph. Uman: Vizavi [in Ukrainian].
- Lytvyn, L. V. (2010). The problem of free development of the individual in the theories of R. Steiner and V. O. Sukhomlynsky. Primary school, 9, 55–59 [in Ukrainian].
- Martianova, M. (2018). Comparative characteristics of pedagogical concepts of Alain, M. Montessori and S. Frenet. Educational discourse, 3-4, 16–26 [in Ukrainian].
- Martianova, M. Ye. (2020). Comparative characteristics of pedagogical concepts of Alain and Olivier Rebula. Pedagogy of the formation of a creative personality in higher and general education schools. Zaporizhzhia, 72(1), 17–21 [in Ukrainian].
- Milenina, H. S. (2015). Pedagogical ideas of Sofia Rusova and Maria Montessori: comparative analysis: autoref. thesis ... candidate ped. of science. Kirovohrad [in Ukrainian].
- Morhun, V. (2013). Paradoxes of pedagogical humanism, or how to love children according to Anton Makarenko and Janusz Korczak. Origins of pedagogical mastery. Ser.: Pedagogical sciences. Poltava, 12, 223–227 [in Ukrainian].
- Surzhykova, I. A. (2003). Pedagogical ideas of Vasyl Sukhomlynsky and Celestine Frenet (comparative analysis): Doctor's thesis. Uman. [in Ukrainian].
- Chernii, A. & Dolid, V. V. (2019). Sukhomlynsky and R. Steiner: comparative analysis of pedagogical ideas. New pedagogical thought, 3, 27–32. [in Ukrainian].

Received 02.10.2024
Accepted 23.10.2024