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ПЕРИОДИЗАЦІЯ РОЗВИТКУ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ ПРО КУЛЬТУРО-ОСВІТНІХ ДІЯЧІВ ЗАКОРДОННЯ В УКРАЇНСЬКІЙ ПЕДАГОГІЧНІЙ КОМПАРАТИВІСТІCI

Анотація. Стаття присвячена проблемі періодизації розвитку досліджень про культурно-освітніх діячів зарубіжжя в українській педагогічній компаративістиці. З’ясовано, що предметом вивчення українських компаративістів є культурно-освітні діячі зарубіжжя, чия освітня діяльність і педагогічна спадщина представляють інтерес для історико-педагогічної науки України. У процесі здійснення умовної періодизації враховують такі фактори: соціально-політичні (зміни в ідейних орієнтах, міжнародних стосунках України, російсько-українська війна тощо); культурно-освітні (інтеграція у європейський освітній простір, зростання інтересу до зарубіжного соціокультурного досвіду, розвиток інформаційно-інформаційної сфери тощо); зміни у національній історико-педагогічній науці та істориографії, що впливають на розвиток досліджень на цьому полі та їх сприяння до існуючих та сучасних методологічних і методичних проблем. За основний критерій розробки такої схеми періодизації визначено зміни у матеріалі та обсягу досліджень, що відображають зміни у дослідницькій інновації та взаємодії з іншими науками.

Ключові слова: періодизація, культурно-освітні діячі, педагогічна компаративістика, історико-педагогічна наука, істориографія, порівняльна педагогіка.

PERIODIZATION OF THE RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT ON FOREIGN CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL WORKERS IN UKRAINIAN PEDAGOGICAL COMPARATIVE SCIENCE

Abstract. This article delves into the concept of periodization concerning the evolution of research on cultural-educational figures from other countries within the context of Ukrainian pedagogical comparativism. It sheds light on Ukrainian comparativists’ emphasis on cultural-educational figures abroad, whose educational contributions and pedagogical legacies hold significance in Ukraine’s historical-pedagogical field. In formulating a structured periodization, various overarching factors influencing this process were taken into account: socio-political elements (such as shifts in ideological perspectives, Ukraine’s international relationships, the impact of the Russo-Ukrainian conflict, etc.); cultural-educational aspects (integration into the European educational sphere, heightened interest in foreign socio-cultural practices, the evolution of the information society, etc.); and the transformations within Ukrainian national humanism and historical-pedagogical science, particularly in the realm of comparativism. The primary criterion for developing such a periodization scheme considered quantitative and qualitative changes that affected the historiographic process of accumulating knowledge on the discussed issue. This included the increase in the number of scholarly works (especially dissertations, professional articles, etc.), changes, and modifications in their substantive characteristics (methodology, introduction of new names into scholarly circulation, etc.).

This study identifies three principal periods in the evolution of research on foreign figures within Ukrainian pedagogical comparativism. The initial phase, termed ‘incipient’ or ‘initial,’ spans from the 1970s to the 1980s, extending beyond
the primary chronological boundaries of our research. The second period, characterized by a personalized direction in Ukrainian pedagogical comparativism, roughly spans from 1991/92 to 2004/05, denoted as the "transitional post-Soviet" era. This phase marked notable shifts in research methodology, transitioning from a Soviet sociologized paradigm of analyzing educational-pedagogical processes to a nationally-oriented approach for study and interpretation. The third period, encompassing 2005/06 to 2025, is referred to as the "Euro-oriented" and "scientifically pluralistic" era. During this phase, active de-Sovietization and de-communization of national historical-pedagogical science facilitated the integration of Western European and American methodological approaches, concepts, research tools, and pedagogical ideologies. Ukraine’s adoption of the Bologna Process in 2005 steered the country towards European educational standards, gradually distancing itself from Russian academic narratives due to the military aggression of the Russian Federation, ultimately leading to a clear rejection of these narratives.

Keywords: periodization, foreign cultural-educational figures, pedagogical comparativist, pedagogical biographistics, pedagogical personality, historical-pedagogical science, historiography, comparative pedagogy.

INTRODUCTION

The problem formulation. Within Ukrainian pedagogical science, ongoing endeavors revolve around the pursuit of new scientific paradigms, innovative educational models, exploration of foreign educational experiences, and a heightened focus on accumulating historical-pedagogical knowledge. Scholars are reevaluating the contributions of educators, scholars, and educational figures whose activities were either suppressed under communist ideology or examined subjectively until 1991. Presently, there’s a concerted effort to explore innovative educational-pedagogical processes that hold historical significance. This exploration extends to Ukrainian comparativism, evolving within an expanding scholarly discourse encompassing both theoretical-methodological frameworks and practical applications. Since gaining independence, Ukrainian pedagogical comparativism has actively delved into the lives, scholarly contributions, and professional experiences of foreign educators and cultural-educational figures. This not only underscores the necessity for specialized advancements in the methodological foundations of pedagogical biographistics but also aims to comprehend scientific accomplishments and identify areas for further exploration in this realm. Introducing a periodization approach to studying the personas of foreign cultural-educational figures within Ukrainian pedagogical comparativism (from the 1990s to the first quarter of the 21st century) will significantly contribute to achieving these objectives.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Pedagogical biographistics in the second half of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century is the subject of study for representatives of various fields of pedagogical science, as it has an interdisciplinary, polystructural, and multilevel nature. Different aspects of the problem indicated in the title have been explored, among other things, in works related to the history of pedagogy (O. Adamenko, H. Bilavych, K. Binytska, L. Berezivska, T. Havrylenko, L. Holubnych, N. Hupan, E. Dniprov, I. Kulyk, I. Rozman, B. Savchuk, I. Strazhnikova, O. Petrenko, N. Pobirchenko, D. Raskin, O. Savchenko, O. Sukhomlynska, etc.), historiography of pedagogical science (I. Rozman, B. Savchuk, I. Strazhnikova, O. Sukhomlynska, etc.), comparative pedagogy (A. Bevor, A. Prizhen, O. Halus, L. Shaposhnikova, A. Kazamias, R. Cohen, M. Lavrychenko, D. Mertens, O. Ovcharuk, S. Tsiura, H. Schukha, etc.), theory and practice of source study, bibliography, particularly pedagogical biographistics (O. Adamenko, L. Berezivska, H. Bielan, N. Dichek, O. Petrenko, etc.), biographies in the fields of philosophy (I. Holubovych, V. Menezhulin, etc.), history (A. Valevskyi, V. Popyk, etc.), psychology and sociology (V. Klymchuk, Ya. Moysienko, V. Konovalchuk, V. Onoprienko, etc.), and literary studies (M. Bagriy, I. Kolesnyk, etc.).

THE AIM AND RESEARCH TASKS

The aim To establish a periodization of studying the personalities of foreign cultural-educational figures in Ukrainian pedagogical comparativism (the 1990s - the first quarter of the 21st century).

RESEARCH METHODS

The methodology of research, functioning as an operational toolkit, encompasses a collection of specific methods, techniques, and approaches that facilitate purposeful and logically grounded actions and procedures when investigating identified issues. Categorized by their essential-functional features, these methods are divided into three primary groups: general scientific, interdisciplinary, and specialized. Each group, as well as individual tools within them, possesses instrumental-cognitive and cognitive capabilities. Under the domain of general scientific methods, we include analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction, abstraction and specification, generalization and comparison, among others. These methods dictate the overall logic of the cognitive process and the substantive direction of our research. Interdisciplinary and disciplinary methods comprise periodization, historical-genetic and historical-structural approaches, retrospective synthesis, historical-logical and comparative-historical methods, retrospectives, historical actualization, and more. These methods define the dynamics, stages, and trends of the overall biographical process and the life path of individual personalities. They aid in dividing biography into distinct components – life path, pedagogical creativity, social activities, etc. – for study and comparison based on specific criteria, features in developmental dynamics and relationships, comprehensiveness of the "spirit of the era," "past through the present," and the "modernization" of past experiences for effective utilization in addressing contemporary educational-pedagogical issues. Partial-scientific methods such as content analysis, discourse analysis, systemic-structural, and systemic-functional methods facilitate the study and development of various aspects of pedagogical biography from the perspective of scientific discourse and the creative legacy of the researched personalities. Source-critical methods (heuristic-search, interpretative, etc.) and historiographical methods (monographic, analysis of the main body of
periodizes the stages of development in the study of cultural-educational figures within Ukrainian pedagogical comparativistics. When clarifying this, we rely on established scientific principles by Ukrainian scholars (Hupan, 2000; Rozman, 2020, p. 159-167; Strazhnikova, 2015, p. 62-70; Sukhomlynska, 2003), according to which periodization is defined as the Ariadne thread, a ‘core model.’ In our case, it defines the dynamics and trends in accumulating scientific knowledge about pedagogical personalities abroad. In doing so, we consider general factors influencing this process: 1) socio-political (changes in ideological orientations, Ukraine’s international relations, the Russian-Ukrainian war, etc.); b) cultural-educational (integration into the European educational space, growing interest in foreign socio-cultural experience, development of the information society, etc.); c) changes in Ukrainian national humanitarianism and historical-pedagogical science, particularly in comparativistics.

Considering the subject and other fundamental parameters of our research, we use quantitative and qualitative changes as the main criterion for developing such a periodization scheme. These changes marked the historiographic process of knowledge accumulation about the addressed issue, involving both an increase in the number of scientific works (primarily dissertations, specialized articles, etc.) and modifications in their substantive-content characteristics (methodology, introduction of new names into scientific circulation, etc.).

The identified and other aspects allow for defining three primary periods in the development of studies on foreign personalities in Ukrainian pedagogical comparativistics. The first period extends beyond the main chronological scope of our research and is termed as the “initial” or “incipient”, covering the 1970s and 1980s. During this time, amidst the complex circumstances of the communist ideological regime, we perceive three crucial shifts in the study, particularly regarding notable foreign educators and the promotion of their creative legacy.

Firstly, the circle of “permissible” figures and the characteristics of their ideas and views were defined. This “template” is illustrated in the significant textbook on the “History of Pedagogy” (1973). In the sections written by well-known Ukrainian Soviet scientists B. Mityurov and M. Grytsenko, there is a fairly extensive array of figures in the development of foreign schools and pedagogy, starting from Socrates, Plato, M. Quintilian, V. Feitl, E. Rotterdam, F. Rabelais, T. More, T. Campanella, M. Luther, and ending with “revolutionary Marxists” A. Bebel, K. Zetkin, and others. They opposed the “bourgeois pedagogy” of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, particularly G. Spencer, G. Kerschensteiner, E. Key, G. Charlemagne, M. Montessori, E. Demolena, W.-A. Lay, E. Meumann, and J. Dewey. Therefore, it cannot be claimed that the names of these educators became “known” in Ukraine only in the 1990s. However, their ideas and views were interpreted as “anti-scientific”, “reactory”, etc. (History of Pedagogy, 1973, pp. 9-26; 79-109).

During this time, within the ideological canons, biographies and pedagogical ideas of “classics of foreign pedagogy” such as J. A. Comenius, J. Locke, D. Bellers, C. Helvetius, D. Diderot, J. J. Rousseau, J. H. Pestalozzi, C. F. Vander, J.-F. Herbert, R. Owen, C. Fourier, A. K. Sensemann, and others were subjectively represented (History of Pedagogy, 1973, pp. 27-78). Therefore, the coverage of the development of foreign pedagogical thought indicates a high degree of personification of this process and the presence of a fairly wide range of its representatives in the field of attention of Ukrainian Soviet historical-pedagogical science, who undoubtedly characterized the dominant ideological canons.

Secondly, during this period, the initial steps were taken in the specialized scientific study of foreign pedagogical figures. Despite certain ideological engagement, the original biographical studies by B. Mityurov on J. A. Comenius, A.-F. Froebel (Mityurov B. N. Friedrich Wilhelm August Froebel. Kyiv: Znannya, 1974. 47 p.; Mityurov B. N., J. A. Comenius: biografiia okremoho liťa. Kyiv: Znannya, 1970. 32 p.; and others) have not lost their scientific value to this day.

Thirdly, within Ukrainian Soviet historical-pedagogical science, institutional foundations were laid for the formation of a personified direction in national pedagogical comparativistics. This refers to the establishment in 1971 of the Department of Scientific-Pedagogical Information at the Ukrainian Research Institute of Pedagogy (later - Institute of Pedagogy of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine). Among its serial publications, the project “Outstanding Educators of the World” (Vydatni pedahohy Ukrainy ta svitu) was successfully implemented, initiating an unbiased study and introduction into scientific circulation of the names and scientific-pedagogical legacy of figures from abroad such as M. Montessori, R. Steiner, P. Freinet, and others (Celetskyi, 2019; Comparative Pedagogy: Methodological Guidelines of Ukrainian Comparativists, 2015).

The second phase in the development of personified direction in Ukrainian pedagogical comparativistics spans roughly from 1991/92 to 2004/05 and is termed as the “transitional post-Soviet” period. Ideologically and theoretically, it is
characterized by “methodology battles” wherein the Soviet sociologizing paradigm for analyzing educational-pedagogical processes was replaced by a nationally oriented model for their study and interpretation. As evidenced by the topics of articles, dissertations, and other scientific materials, the range of researched figures did not significantly expand during this period: figures like J. Locke, J.-F. Herbert, C. Freinet, M. Montessori, G. Spencer, G. Kerschensteiner, M. Gandhi, I. Korczak, among others, remained within the scope of investigation.

The institutional progress within the historical-pedagogical science contributed to the advancement of studies in this direction. Particularly, the transformation of the aforementioned department into the Laboratory of Comparative Pedagogy at the Institute of Pedagogy of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine in 1991 facilitated the development of methodological principles of pedagogical comparativistics and the preparation of fundamental research on the development of foreign educational systems (Celetskyi, 2019; Comparative Pedagogy: Methodological Guidelines of Ukrainian Comparativists, 2015).

The third period from 2005/06 to 2025 is defined as “Euro-oriented” and “scientifically pluralistic”. Active de-Sovietization and de-communication of national historical and pedagogical science facilitated the study of representatives of foreign pedagogical thought. There was active assimilation of Western European and American methodological approaches, concepts, research tools, and pedagogical ideas. Ukraine’s accession to the Bologna Process in 2005 led to the orientation towards and transition to European education requirements and standards. There was a gradual departure from the influence of Russian scientific narratives, culminating in a definitive rejection prompted by the military aggression of the Russian Federation.

The distinctive dynamics of this process are marked by dividing the third period into three phases of formation and development of the personified direction of pedagogical comparativistics. The first phase (2005-2008) was characterized by an intensification of studies and an expansion of their thematic spectrum. Alongside well-known figures, the life and work of understudied figures, whom Soviet propaganda portrayed as “bourgeois reactionaries” such as O. Nill, E. Meiman, P. Natorp, P. Petersen, and others, became the subject of comprehensive works.

The second phase from 2009 to 2020 is characterized by an intensification of biographical studies on foreign figures, refinement of methodological principles, the development of typological schemes for their research, expansion of the bibliographic database, and a deeper understanding of this process within scholarly discourse. Alongside the development of the mentioned group of comparative-personified studies, the subject field of pedagogical comparativistics widens with the emergence of new names. This accumulation of knowledge is traced not only in scholarly articles (such as those by Sh.-M. de Lep’ie (Mikhno, 2022) and others) but also in dissertation research dedicated to the creative legacy of J. Holt (Ruban, 2012), K. Rogers (Bochkarova, 2013), E. Rayerson (Huk, 2014), N. F. Gruntvig (Shuhalli, 2015), J. Tolkien (Labunets, 2016), Ch. V. Eliot (Liaturynska, 2016), A. Reichwein (Torbunova, 2017), Al-Farabi (Al-Samarrai Alaa Khussein Malu, 2020), E.-O. Chartier (Martianova, 2021), and others.

A positive trend emerged with the broadening of the chronotope of studies. «Horizontally» this manifested in increased attention to studying personalities not only from European countries and the USA but also from the Asian continent. Vertically, alongside the traditionally prioritized focus on figures whose activities spanned the late 19th to early 20th centuries (a constellation of educational reformers) and the second half of the 18th to 19th centuries (the “founders” of scientific pedagogy), there was a reinforced, synthesized, scholarly-theoretical study conducted in a distant historical retrospective—not only at the level of reference and educational literature. This was reflected in comprehensive studies, both personified (such as on Confucius (Shparyk, 2012) and others) and prosopographical. For example, studies on the development of pedagogical thought in the ancient world and the Middle Ages (Marmurash, 2009), on the spiritual-moral paradigm of education among early Christian educators in medieval Europe, and more.

The onset of the third phase is associated with the large-scale armed aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine in February 2022. This aggression temporarily paralyzed and became a significant brake on the development of the educational process and scientific research in our country. Simultaneously, it led to a definitive and resolute rejection of using the scientific-pedagogical heritage of representatives of the aggressor country and Belarus as its accomplice. This rejection impacted not only on a “mental” level but also in official resolutions prohibiting the use and citation of works by Russian scholars in professional scientific articles, dissertations, and more.

For the third period, there was further development of the institutional structure of comparative pedagogy in Ukraine, which stimulated the development of its methodology and the expansion and growth of various priority directions in scientific research. Three main academic centers in this field intensified their activities. The staff of the Laboratory (renamed to Department in 2015) of Comparative Pedagogy at the Institute of Pedagogy of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine in 2009 initiated the publication of the specialized journal “Comparative Pedagogical Studies,” prepared valuable scientific and methodological materials (N. Lavrychenko, O. Lokshyna, and others), and a series of fundamental works that deepen the understanding of the development of educational systems in the countries of the European Union and the United States (“Comparative Pedagogy: Methodological Orientations of Ukrainian Comparativists,” 2015), and so forth. This strengthened the scientific-theoretical foundation for the development of the personalized direction of Ukrainian pedagogical comparative studies.

Active work in these directions is carried out by the Department of Foreign Pedagogical Education for Adults established in 2015 within the structure of the Institute of Pedagogical Education and Adult Education of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine (since 2016, the Department of Foreign Systems of Pedagogical Education and Adult Education) (Avsheniuk, 2015; “Modern Models of Professional Education and Training in EU Countries: Comparative Experience,” 2018), which, together with Khmelnytskyi National University since 2011, publishes the scientific journal
“Comparative Professional Pedagogy”. The third academic center, the Department of Comparative Studies of Information and Educational Innovations at the Institute of Information Technologies and Learning Tools of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine, has accumulated valuable experience in the development of educational and methodological support for implementing innovations in various types of educational institutions. An important component of it is the dissemination of knowledge about representatives of foreign pedagogical thought.

The analysis conducted provides grounds to assert the accumulation of knowledge in the field of Ukrainian comparative studies. However, as of the end of 2023, it’s premature to speak of the formation of scientific schools specifically focused on the development of the personalized direction of Ukrainian pedagogical comparative studies. Nevertheless, judging from the results of the preparation of scientific and pedagogical personnel (defended dissertations) and publishing activities, their future contours are emerging in the form of academic institutions and universities in Ukraine, such as the Institute of Pedagogy of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University, Taras Shevchenko Luhansk National University, among others.

CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

The subject of research for Ukrainian comparativists encompasses cultural and educational figures abroad, whose educational activities and pedagogical legacy are of interest to the historical-pedagogical science of Ukraine. Given this, there is a need for the periodization of the study of personalities of foreign cultural-educational figures in Ukrainian pedagogical comparativistics (the 1990s - the first quarter of the 21st century).

The periodization involved defining the stages of development in the research of cultural-educational figures within Ukrainian pedagogical comparativism. Ukrainian scholars (N. Hupan, I. Rozman, I. Strazhnikova, O. Sukhomlynska, and others) relied on the scientifically theoretical propositions, according to which periodization is defined as a “core model” that determined the dynamics and trends in the accumulation of scientific knowledge by Ukrainian comparativism regarding pedagogical personalities abroad. In the process of implementing this conditional periodization, general factors influencing this process were taken into account: socio-political factors (changes in ideological orientations, international relations of Ukraine, the Russo-Ukrainian war, etc.); cultural-educational factors (integration into the European educational space, increased interest in foreign socio-cultural experiences, the development of the information society, etc.); changes in Ukrainian national humanities and the historical-pedagogical sciences, particularly comparativism. The main criterion for developing such a periodization scheme was based on quantitative and qualitative changes that affected the historiographic process of accumulating knowledge on the discussed issue. Specifically, consideration was given to the increase in the number of scientific works (primarily dissertations, professional articles, etc.), changes, and modifications in their substantive characteristics (methodology, introduction of new names into scientific circulation, etc.).

These and other aspects allowed for the identification of three main periods in the development of research on foreign personalities in Ukrainian pedagogical comparativistics. The first period, falling outside the primary chronological boundaries of our research, is defined as “initial” or “nascent,” covering the 1970s-1980s. The second period of the development of the personalized direction in Ukrainian pedagogical comparativistics spans approximately from 1991/92 to 2004/05 and is termed as the “transitional post-Soviet” period. During this period, significant changes occurred in the methodology of research, shifting from a Soviet sociological paradigm of analyzing educational processes to a nationally-oriented model of their study and interpretation. The third period from 2005/06 to 2025 is identified as “Euro-oriented” and “scientifically pluralistic”. It was revealed that during this period, the study of representatives of foreign pedagogical thought was supported by active de-Sovietization and de-communization of national historical-pedagogical science, absorption of Western European and American methodological approaches, concepts, research tools, and pedagogical ideas, Ukraine’s accession to the Bologna Process (2005), orientation towards European educational requirements and standards, gradual departure from Russian scientific narratives, and the final rejection of prompted by the military aggression of the Russian Federation.

Further research requires a more detailed elucidation of the achievements of Ukrainian comparativists during each of the conditionally delineated periods.
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