

Комарова О. І. – викладач кафедри іноземних мов Полтавського національного технічного університету імені Юрія Кондратюка (м. Полтава, Україна).
E-mail: positiv_poltava@ukr.net

Komarova O.I. – Lecturer of the Chair of feoreign languages of Poltava National Technical University named after Yuriy Kondratyuk (Poltava, Ukraine). E-mail: positiv_poltava@ukr.net

Рецензент – кандидат технічних наук, доцент О. А. Северин

Reviewer – Candidate of Technical Sciences, Associate Professor O.A. Severin

УДК 378.4.014.6(477.54) "18/191"

INNOVATIVE TENDENCIES IN SEARCH FOR THE MODEL OF HIGH QUALITY PEDAGOGICAL EDUCATION IN THE LATE XIX - EARLY XX CENTURIES (EXPERIENCE OF KHARKIV IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY)

Serhiy M. Kulish

This research focuses on the activities of Kharkiv Imperial University faculties in the late XIX – early XX century in search for innovations and contribution to the development of teacher training and science.

Key words: *Kharkiv University, professor, pedagogy, teacher training, the Ministry of Education, methodology.*

The processes occurring in the society in all spheres of life and with the entry of Ukraine into the European educational space call for rethinking and analyzing traditional approaches to organization of university pedagogical education. Solving the problems of teacher staff training, we are increasingly often turning to the history of universities and looking for innovations in the pedagogical education of the past.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the activities of the faculty of Kharkiv Imperial University in the late XIX - early XX centuries in search for innovations in pedagogical education and their contribution to the development of pedagogical science.

At the end of the XIX century educational institutions of the Russia dominated Ukraine could not meet the rapidly growing needs of the society in the teaching staff of the future. The requirements to the staff became purely symbolic, low standards of pedagogic education of the major part of the teaching staff led to domination of scholasticism, formalism and bureaucracy in public schools. As for the literature available to teachers, these were mostly articles of didactic and methodological character but there was no fundamental professional handbook available. Among Ukrainian educators mostly publicly known were M. I. Pirogov and K. D. Ushinskiy; even the scholarly heritage of Kant, who considers pedagogy to be not only a science but also an art, was not never known. There were no followers of a famous Russian pedagogue M. O. Lavrovsky, and in the bibliographical work "The Book of Books" published in 1892, where there was a pedagogical section, his name was never mentioned.

Being well aware of the secondary and primary school drawbacks, the professors of the School of History and Philology resorted to the analysis of the teaching staff problems. In their view, pedagogical clubs existing at the time worked very unsatisfactorily. Due to the heavy workload school teachers were not involved into teaching materials development; the exchange of experience was virtually absent, and advanced teaching methods were being lost because of the poor awareness of them. Therefore on the 28th of March 1891 following the example set by St. Petersburg Pedagogical Society, the members of the Historical and Philological Society of Kharkiv University established a teaching department. This department was later divided into two commissions – historical and literary [1, p. XVII-XVIII; 5, p. 134]. At the meetings of the sub-divisions, high school teachers presented reviews, while talks on various topics were delivered by the professors of the university. Methods of teaching languages and history, the value of written works, the role of ethics, love for reading were considered. [2, p. 11, 6, p. 9].

Many educators of the time were concerned about the issues of teacher trainings. P. F. Kapteryev, stressing that "there is no place to train teachers for specialized and ordinary secondary schools. We not only lack pedagogical

departments but pedagogy itself is not read in any institution of higher education except religious academies". [3, p. 78].

A significant contribution to the development of the methodology of the time was made by prof. D. I. Bagaliy. In 1894 he expressed his view of the competence of the areas of didactics and methodology; he stated that as we descend from the heights of science to the lower areas of elementary teaching, methods and techniques gain importance. D. I. Bagaliy pointed out that university professors do without methods, limiting themselves to the ability to read a demonstration lecture on a particular course; unfortunately, in order to recognize them as satisfactory, "no special pedagogical methods are needed." The art of words, rhythm, diction, pauses was meanwhile in the background; the main factor in obtaining a position was the knowledge and the critical/analytical view of sources. As for the schools of a lower level, he emphasized that without teaching skills and habits it was impossible to work there. Meanwhile, specialised school teachers taught without basic knowledge of pedagogical technologies because university programs according to which they were trained "included neither methodology or even general pedagogy." This conclusion also referred to historical disciplines so both practicing teachers and university academies in history were supposed to develop a methodology of teaching history, according to D. I. Bagaliy. [4]

Indisputable enthusiast in pedagogical innovations was prof. M. F. Sumtsov, member of the Board of Trustees in the Kharkiv educational district, guardian of Pushkin public school, who in his works on didactics emphasized the importance of clarity, consistency ("conscientious attitude to fact") ("juxtaposing facts and events") and individual approach. He considered the functions of tuition to be primarily educational, pedagogic, and developmental and those of art – informative/ educational, aesthetic/transformational [5]. It was M. F. Sumtsov who supported the work of KHIPT with his energy and prowess because due to lack of activity of the members of the department in autumn 1895 some organizational difficulties emerged.

At different times such famous teachers as O. O. Potebnya, Ye. K. Redin, K. K. Voigt and M. N. Petrov tried "to overcome the pragmatic/rational, entertaining/consumering approach to education, to strengthen the role of emotional/artistic factor" [6, p. 91-93]. It should be noted that the subject of speeches at the meetings of the pedagogic department was very diverse. For instance, S. O. Nemolodyshev from the female gymnasium

№1 told about the pedagogical views of the Moscow Metropolitan Platon, that the views in his opinion were marked with humanism, tolerance and sincerity and therefore had such an impact on the successor to the Russian throne. Making a speech on February 6, 1898, he remarked that A. Kamensky, J. Locke, J-J. Rousseau, I. Pestalozzi considered that education somehow suppressed upbringing, and this tendency was observed in schooling of history.

Not everyone agreed with the thesis of V. I. Khariev's speech "On Pedagogy and Pedagogical Training" delivered on March 17, 1990. The speaker maintained that the revival of secondary school teaching requires a system of higher pedagogical education, whereas the art of teaching will be mastered in practice, since "methodology and didactics are always but a belated reproduction of one state of scientific theory or another". In his view, it is not the practice with the dominance of routine that is of the greatest value, but the experience obtained by colleagues and the exchange of ideas at teaching staff meetings [7, p. VIII, XI; 13, p. II-VII].

From 1892 to 1902 the pedagogical branch included 94 teachers, there were 100 reports presented at its meeting, also the period witnessed publishing of 7 issues of "Proceedings of the Pedagogical Branch of Kharkiv Historical and Philological Society". However, a long period of silence followed, as some teachers withdrew from the society, others left Kharkiv, and still others died [8, p. 120–121].

Sometimes university lecturers and Ministry officials voiced offers to establish departments of pedagogy. For instance, on November 18, 1898 the Minister of Public Education M. P. Boholievov called it unacceptable for teachers to learn at the expense of their students, as teachers must be taught pedagogical techniques first. Unfortunately, quite many university lecturers supported the opposite viewpoint articulated by R. Yu. Vipper, professor of Moscow University. He called pedagogy "a shallow subject based on trivialities and truisms, a subject that cannot boast anything solid: it includes bits of physiology and hygiene, psychology and ethics". By the way, the University of Warsaw chose not to establish a department of pedagogy fearing that absorption in didactics would distract lecturers and students from pure science [9, p. 47].

Finally, on December 9, 1899 the School of History and Philology of Kharkiv University requested from the Ministry the permission to introduce history and theory of pedagogy as well as methodology of teaching subjects in specialized schools into the curriculum, wishing to make pedagogy a compulsory subject at this school, as a distinguished Professor of Philosophy

F. O. Zelenohorskyi had already been teaching these subjects as electives since the spring of 1899.

With time Kharkiv University became a pioneer in the renovation of pedagogical teaching. It happened in spite of numerous objections to the educational aspect of pedagogy among the professorate, which thought that university had no spare money for questionable practices in training adults. In 1902 Professor V. Ivanovskiy failed to find pedagogy course in the curriculum of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge in England. There was mainly practical pedagogy, in these higher educational establishments, which was guided by examples, traditions and discipline.

Meanwhile at the end of 1902 higher educational establishments' reorganization commission of the Russian Federation examined a topical issue of preparing university faculty. Its view points split. Some of them claimed after graduating from the university one needs no less than 15 months for mastering pedagogical techniques, others objected the very possibility of teaching pedagogical skills – only long pedagogical practice and teacher's talent, in their opinion, make a real teacher. After discussing the main problems, the commission recommended students of the department of history and philology, and physicos and mathematics to attend the history of pedagogical studies, pedagogy in the light of modern pedagogical theories, didactics, methodology for specific purposes, and school hygiene [10, c.215–220, 226].

The Ministry of National Education offered to discuss the idea of pedagogy teaching at the department of history and philology of St. Vladimir Kiev University on the April 8, 1904. In case this step is approved, the university was to prepare a teaching program. During this year not only theoretical, but also practical pedagogical classes were held in Kharkov University. There were conducted by F. O. Zelenogorsky. In autumn 1904 questions on pedagogy were included into the course of child's psychology [11, c. 532; 32, c. 10].

Later on April 24, 1904 the Ministry of National Education, on taking into consideration D. I. Bagalia's opinion, introduced pedagogy as a compulsory subject for students of the department of history and philology to Kharkiv University curriculum [12, c. 62]. At first pedagogy was introduced where they had appropriate conditions, and then it was introduced as an optional subject. This step was already important, because in 1905 Russian universities did not plan to open a department of history and philology [13].

The first decade of the XIXth century passed and unfavorable attitude to pedagogy began showing its consequences. The quality students in philology – these were they who mostly became school and gymnasium teachers– got worse. The professorate pointed out a general decrease in interest to the specialty, apathy and mental passivity which showed itself especially during exams.

As a result, the quality of teaching and discipline was decreasing in secondary educational establishments. However, authors of pedagogical works repeating over and over that progress in university teaching comes from inspiration and enthusiasm, but not from didactic rules; everything was defined by teaching techniques, virtuosity of scientific thought, its originality [14, c. 15]. It was stated that in pedagogical books there was lack of clear proof that it is a science, and the majority of the given data indicated to its artistic character. According to some scientists, and pedagogy was more necessary for women, as it had utilitarian object of social-ideal content [15, c. I-II, 10, 41, 47].

Under the circumstances in teaching districts of the Russian Empire temporary pedagogical courses were introduced on the 10th of June 1909. The practice of sending teachers on business abroad was started for the first time. For example, for preparing the faculty for Belorussia schools, in Kharkiv university 20 scholarships were given to those who wanted to work as teachers there [16, c. 57].

In May 1912 the regular resolution “About the Courses for Preparing Male and Female Teachers for Secondary Schools” came out. For the year, a range of subjects was being taught at the courses: logics, psychology, school hygiene, methodology (with practice in Russian and folklore), Latin, Russian and General History, Mathematics, Geography and Mathematical Geography, Natural Sciences, Chemistry, Physics, German and French and their Methodology, the History of Pedagogy [17, c. 94–95]. The courses of further education for teachers of national schools were opened, where there were 164 hours for pedagogical study and General children’s psychology, Methodology of teaching maths basics, Russian History and Literature, Law, Entry to national economy, Folk and children’s literature, Southern Russian (Ukrainian) history and literature, Natural sciences, Handicrafts, Painting and Modeling [18, c. 75–76].

Temporary practical pedagogical courses for teachers of primary national schools affiliated to Kharkiv University, organized by P. E. Sokolovsky, studied rational teaching and progressive methodologies. In

June 1910 over 700 teachers arrived at the courses not only from the Kharkiv region, but also from the Voronezh, the Katerinoslavsk, the Grodnensk regions, the Kaluga and the Minsk provinces. The audience was mainly women, as at that time there was only one teacher training college and two district schools with pedagogical courses in Kharkiv region, where only male teachers were taught, but female teachers were all trained by women gymnasiums. The courses were given by professors and teachers from Kharkiv University: Botany – by professor V.M. Arnoldi; Physics – by assistant Sakharov; Zoology and Physiology – by professor Nikolskyi; Law – by professor M. I. Paliyenko; Russian History – by professor V. I. Savva; Russian Teaching Methodology and Didactics – assistant professor V. Khartsiev [19].

Despite the significant progress, before World War I schools in Russia were not comprehensive and they had a low bureaucratic and professionally oriented nature. The saddest thing was the fact that the representatives of the State Duma of Russia and other authorities believed that the issues of education and training were not urgent, there were some more important problems that needed solving [20, p. 3, 11, 51]. The understanding of the importance of pedagogical and didactic innovations for personal professional development of teachers found more supporters due to the great efforts of progressive educators and the educational area of Kharkiv. A pedagogical exhibition worked in Kharkiv at that time and in 1913 Pedagogical Museum was opened. It was in 1913 when they opened the exhibition of exemplary teaching in the building of Gymnasium II. University teachers were involved in supplying the six sections of the exhibition with illustrative aids, typical written work, history, geography, drawing and school furniture items [21]. Kharkiv university professors worked hard in order to improve teaching in high school. The problem of teaching mathematics was the experts' main concern. Thus, Professor Russ`yan, analyzing written works of school-leavers in 1907, paid special attention to low points (3,3-3,5) in mathematics. The pupils were not good at mathematical terms, they could not choose the rational doing of the sum, they did not master drawing at their geometry classes, etc. [22, p. 364-365]. In this regard, D. M. Sintsov believed that intending teachers must take the course of history of mathematics, basic geometry, some sections of elementary geometry. He recommended to include higher mathematics into the curriculum of high school; higher mathematics had been taught in schools of Western Europe and the United States by then [23, p. 69, 71].

From 1912 to 1916 experimental pedagogy (pedology) drew the attention of the scholars who studied the psychophysical nature of the child. The concept of “pedology” first appeared in the thesis of an American scientist A. Krisman in 1896. Those scholars working in Kharkiv focused primarily on pedology because most of them were convinced that pedagogics is not a separate subject and should belong to youth studies, theory of school organization and science. So in the summer of 1915 Doctor A. Z. Rabinovich proposed to create Kharkiv Pedological Museum similar to those working at that time. Besides, the proposals that were made at the Third All-Russian Congress of Experimental Pedagogy which brought together more than 300 participants (mainly school teachers) were also of great importance. In his report “Pedagogy in Higher Education” V. V. Uspensky not just demanded creating an independent teaching science in Russia, but also realizing that this goal could be achieved only through creation of full-fledged pedagogical departments in universities with their interfaculty nature [24, p. 140-144 , 152].

Talking about the contribution of Kharkiv University professors and the Kharkiv school area teachers to developing pedagogy; one should focus on the pedagogical congress of secondary education which took place from the 1st to the 11th of June of 1916. At the Congress they discussed the issues of "illegality" (those delivered in the summer of 1915 at the Ministry of Education conference) and decided to eliminate the system of special rights of leavers of specialized school (gymnasiums) that no longer met the requirements of the time. In addition to it, the members of the Congress expressed their opinion against the formal external discipline in school, advocated teaching intelligent power requirements, criticized the pupils being overloaded with lessons of Latin and Greek [25 , p. 5,7]. They also touched upon the issues of mastering the psychological poetics of O. O. Potebnya by teachers in high schools the basic theory of verbal poetry and prose, the value of biological stations for teaching science. Professor D. M. Sintsov delivered the history of strengthening interdisciplinary ties (between mathematics and physics, in particular). The headmaster of Izyum real school M. Shevchenko offered to introduce a legislation course to the programme of the History and Philology faculty and review it according to the programme of 1905. Demands were made for improving the teaching of the theory and practice of pedagogy in a girls' high schools and eparchial girls' high schools [26, p. 4].

Describing the overall educational system, it should be noted that by 1917 there had been a need for restructuring both in secondary schools and in

higher educational establishments. Although traditional ignoring of pedagogy made considerable harm on all levels, drove teachers to a standstill and was clear to the public, the long-awaited creation of departments of pedagogy (which was prepared in the summer of 1917 at the departments of History and Philology in the draft Charter of universities) was not expected [27, p. 24].

Thus, at the 90^{ies} of the XIX and at the beginning of the XX century the teaching science continued to pave its way into the educational system and achieved obvious progress in it. A significant contribution in this case belonged to the teachers and professors of Kharkiv University. Despite the obstacles of traditionally skeptical attitude of the educational community, concerning introduction of educational pedagogy to the educational process in higher educational institutions, high schools and schools at that time, the professors of Kharkiv University were in constant search for innovations in research and teachers' training at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. New courses in pedagogy, methodology and practice of subject teaching were introduced. Pedagogical exhibitions were created. In spite of all the difficulties, the Kharkiv professors promoted and moved forward innovations in research and teachers' training education.

Literature

1. Сборник Харьковского историко-филологического общества. Т. 3. – Х. : Тип. К. Л. Счасни, 1891. – XXVII, 341 с.
2. Труды педагогического отдела Харьковского историко-филологического общества. – 1893. – Вып. 1. – 118 с.
3. Заварзина Л. Э. П. Ф. Каптерев – студент Московской духовной академии // Педагогика. – 2011. – № 3. – С. 69-80.
4. Багалея Д. Несколько слов об элементарной методике истории / Д. Багалея. – Х., 1894. – 10 с.
5. Кін О. М. Проблеми навчання і виховання в педагогічній спадщині М. Сумцова : автореф. дис. ... канд. пед. наук / О. М. Кін. – Х., 2001. – 19 с.
6. Шумська О. О. Розробка змісту художнього виховання майбутніх учителів у педагогічній спадщині викладачів Харківського університету (друга половина XIX – початок XX ст.) / О. О. Шумська // Вісник Луган. нац. ун-ту імені Тараса Шевченка. Пед. науки. – 2010. – Ч. 4. – С. 90-94.
7. Труды педагогического отдела Харьковского историко-филологического общества. – 1900. – Вып. 6.
8. Ветухов А. В. О деятельности педагогического отдела Х. И. Ф. Общества в первое десятилетие – 1892–1902 года / А. В. Ветухов // Сб. Харьк. ист.-филол. о-ва. – 1905. – Т. 14. – С. 109–122.

9. Карнаух Н. В. О значении педагогических знаний в профессиональной подготовке преподавателей высшей школы в дореволюционной России / Н. В. Карнаух // Вест. Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитар. ун-та. Сер. 4 : Педагогика. Психология. – 2010. – Вып. 1 (16). – С. 41–49.
10. Труды высочайше утвержденной комиссии.. Вып. 1...
11. Сборник постановлений и распоряжений начальства.../ сост. П. В. Воловенко)... – 1912...
12. Петренко Н. В. Культурно-освітня спадщина вчених Слобожанщини другої половини ХІХ – початку ХХ століття (історико-педагогічний аспект) : монографія / Н. В. Петренко, С. Г. Золотухіна. – Х. : ХДУХТ, 2010. – 186 с.
13. Проект общего Устава Императорских российских университетов. – СПб., 1905. – 71 с.
14. Петражицкий Л. И. Университет и наука. Опыт теории и техники университетского дела и научного самообразования. Т. 2 : Практические выводы / Л. И. Петражицкий. – СПб. : Тип. Ю. Н. Эрлих, 1907. – 639 с.
15. Волкович В. А. Педагогическая наука перед судом её противников / В. А. Волкович. – СПб. : Изд. О. Богдановой, 1909. – 47 с.
16. Журнал Министерства народного просвещения. Новая серия – 1909. – Ч. 22.
17. Овчинников А. В. Модернизация отечественного образования в условиях политического кризиса начала ХХ в. / А. В. Овчинников // Педагогика. – 2011. – № 6. – С. 86–98.
18. Столярчук Т. О. Педагогічні курси як одна із форм підготовки та підвищення кваліфікації вчителя народних шкіл (друга половина ХІХ – початок ХХ ст.) / Т. О. Столярчук // Вісн. Житомир. держ. ун-ту імені І. Франка. – Вип. 54. – 2010. – С. 74–77.
19. Пісочинець Д. Харківські учительські курси // Світло. – 1910. – Кн. 1. – С. 36–40.
20. Вахтеров В. П. Основы новой педагогики. Т. I. / В. П. Вахтеров. – М. : Изд-во т-ва И. Д. Сытина, 1913. – 583 с.
21. Краткое описание педагогической показательной выставки при Харьковском учебном округ / сост. Г. П. Окунев. – Х. : Знание, 1913. – 30 с.
22. Руссьян Ц. К. Некоторые замечания о характере работ, исполненных учениками гимназий на испытаниях зрелости в Харьковском учебном округе за 1907–1913 г. / Ц. К. Руссьян // Математическое образование. – 1913. – № 8. – С. 363–367.
23. Синцов Д. М. По поводу одной книги : [рец.] // Мат. образование. – 1913. – № 1. – С. 67–76. – Рец. на кн. : Мрочек В. Педагогика математики. Исторические и методические этюды. Т. 1 / В. Мрочек, Ф. Филиппович. – СПб. : Книгоизд-во О. Богдановой, 1910.–VI, 380 с.
24. Фарфоровский С. Третий всероссийский съезд по экспериментальной педагогике / С. Фарфоровский // Журн. М-ва нар. просвещения. Новая серия. – 1916. – Ч. 62 – С. 137–152.

25. Первый съезд Харьковского учебного округа по вопросам среднего образования с 1-го по 11-е июня 1916 года в г. Харькове. № 1. – Х. : Тип. и литогр. М. Зильберберг и с-вья, 1916. – 7 с.

26. Первый съезд Харьковского учебного округа по вопросам среднего образования ... – № 3.

27. ІР НБУ імені В. Вернадського, ф. 8, спр. 2836.

ІННОВАЦІЙНІ ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ В ПОШУКУ МОДЕЛІ ВИСОКОЇ ЯКІСНОЇ ПЕДАГОГІЧНОЇ ОСВІТИ У КІНЦІ ХІХ - ПОЧАТКУ ХХ ВВ (ДОСВІД ХАРКІВСЬКОГО ІМПЕРСЬКОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ)

С. Н. Куліш

Стаття присвячена діяльності факультетів Харківського Імператорського університету наприкінці ХІХ – початку ХХ століття, спрямованої на пошук інновацій і вклад у розвиток педагогічної освіти і науки.

Ключові слова: Харківський університет, професор, підготовка викладачів, Міністерство освіти, методологія.

ИННОВАЦИОННЫЕ ТЕНДЕНЦИИ В ПОИСКЕ МОДЕЛИ ВЫСОКОГО КАЧЕСТВЕННОГО ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ В КОНЦЕ ХІХ – НАЧАЛЕ ХХ ВВ (ОПЫТ ХАРЬКОВСКОГО ИМПЕРСКОГО УНИВЕРСИТЕТА)

С. Н. Кулиш

Статья посвящена деятельности факультетов Харьковского Императорского университета в конце ХІХ – начале ХХ вв., направленной на поиск инноваций и вклад в развитие педагогического образования и науки.

Ключевые слова: Харьковский университет, профессор, подготовка преподавателей, Министерство образования, методология.

Куліш С.Н. – кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри українознавства Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна (м. Харків, Україна) vk@univer.kharkov.ua

Serhiy M. Kulish - PhD in historical sciences, associate professor V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University vk@univer.kharkov.ua

Рецензент – доктор педагогічних наук, професор Є. А. Зеленов

Reviewer – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Ye.A. Zelenov