

O. G. Petryshen, Donbass State Technical University

O. ZALUZHNYI ON THE THEORY OF COLLECTIVE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN

Petryshen O. H.

O. Zaluzhnyi on the Theory of Collective Education of Children

The problem of collective education theory in Zaluzny's creative heritage in the 20-th of XX century is considered in the article.

It is mentioned, that methodological reference point for Zaluzny's definition of children's collective entity (nature) is the state of reflexology about personal and collective behavior as the reaction for definite irritants. However, Zaluzny did not pay attention to the educational potential of children's collective and the problems of its forming and development.

As it was observed, in the second half of the 20-th and at the beginning of the 30-th of XX century the definition of collective that was given by pedagogists was more known. The psychological aspects of this definition functioning were pointed there.

It is stressed in the article, that scientist paid attention to the question of the difference between individualistic and collective pedagogy. It is well known, that Zaluzny was one of the first scientist who raised a question about collective development. Zaluzny thought, that it was important to find some feature of the collective that can be recognized by the objective way of observation and base it on the foundation of classification. The work classification of children's collective of Zaluzny is considered in the article.

Key words: collective, upbringing, reflexology, education, collective reaction.

Social and economic, political and cultural processes that have recently had place in Ukrainian society require significant changes in education and the upbringing of future generations. Not by chance educational reform in Ukraine is still in process and they are aimed at introducing new approaches, forms and methods of upbringing that would meet the needs of the individual, contribute to disclosure of their talents, of spiritual, emotional, mental and physical abilities.

In modern conditions the social role of the individual is increased, great importance is given to individual-oriented pedagogy, which is designed to form

consciousness of future citizens, stated in the regulations – National Doctrine of Education Development of Ukraine in the XXI century, Ukrainian Act “On education” and other ... At the same time, education of child in the collective and through the collective is not less significant in the educational process. Unfortunately, in recent years the problems of collective education has been neglected. However, the acquisition of social experience, self-identity is largely derived in the process of communication and interaction in the collective, which is an important educational, organizing and controlling factor. It is essential to study and pedagogical domestic experience of 20-ies of the XX century, because during this period pedagogical theorists and experts actively engaged in the search for new ways to develop the child’s personality, trying to use the educational opportunities of the collective. As a consequence, the question about the need to develop a full-fledged theory of upbringing collective arose. That became the subject of discussion and debate in the domestic pedagogy of the 20th years. Problems of collective upbringing found a wide enough coverage of scientific and pedagogical literature. Theoretical bases of upbringing of young people in the collective were regarded by the Soviet pedagogues (Gordin A., Karakovsky V., Kurakin A., Makarenko A., Sukhomlinsky V. etc.) and modern Ukrainian and Russian researchers (Andreeva V., Podlasiy I., Stepanova A., Truhin I., etc.). A significant amount of historical and pedagogical researches, which traced the formation and development of the theory and practice of collective upbringing have been conducted. Separate aspects of the history of using a collective as a factor in the educational influence are presented in summarizing historical and pedagogical studies (Zadorozhnaja L., Trigger A., Levkovsky M., Medved A., Mosiyashenko A., Stuparik B., Sukhomlinsky A., etc.).

Views concerning the issue of the collective outstanding foreign and domestic scientists Korczak J. (Denisyuk S., Zabytaya T.), Makarenko A.(Buchkivska V., Gaida I., Karpenchuk S., Nosovets N.) Sukhomlinsky V. (Bondarenko G., Buchkivska V., Dubinka M., Kalmykov G., Kondrat V., Novgorodskaya Yu., etc.) were studied in the dissertational historical and pedagogical studies.

There is a significant number of historical and pedagogical publications devoted to the study of development of the domestic educational theory and practice in the 20–30 years of the XX century (Vinogradov-Bondarenko V., Karamazov A., Kovalenko V., Kuchta M., Lukyanov V., Palyukh S.).

Conducted historiographical analysis gives reason to believe that the post-Soviet domestic historians of pedagogy, investigating development of education in the 20-30s of the twentieth century, did not pay proper attention to development of child collective in that period. Traditionally, the analysis is focused only on the contribution of A. Makarenko. Meanwhile it was not only Makarenko who developed the domestic theory of the collective, other well-known teachers, pedologists, the organizers of education of that period also made their contribution. The purpose of this article is to determine the nature of collective education of children in the heritage of O. Zaluzhnyi. Since the mid 20-s of XX century a specific task – study of “social-class environment”, the organization and activities of a collective of children was lying in front of scientists-pedologists. During that period a special term was used in the literature – “collective pedagogy”. We observe that the Third All-Ukrainian Conference on Teacher Education gave start to the development of a full-fledged theory of the collective, held in 1924. Ryappo Ya. in his report described the process of reform of the educational sector in Ukraine, confirmed previously adopted principal changes in teacher education. Among the main points of his speech was the issue of collective education. “If attention of social education is focused on a child’s life organization in collective and the ideal form, the main factor, the essence and content of social education is children communist movement, – he stressed, – that the factor of social education, and higher educational courses should be based on the pedagogical process based on children collective with its internal and public relations and pedagogy collective that explains the laws and forms of his behavior” [1, p. 164]. At that time the child’s movement was both an important factor of social education, which organized childhood and gave content to "social upbringing" and it was its real foundation. Social education as the only upbringing or pedagogical process was necessary had “adaptation of children to work of human community, the study of this

activity and the direct participation in it ... and not individual participation but in the form of labor collective” [2, p. 121] as a sole educational or upbringing process.

Considering the above, the children’s movement theorist I. Sokolyansky believed that all children’s groups must be formed and act as children collectives, because “only an organized collective can arrange treatment of personality” [3, p. 18]. As we can see, in 1924, course was chosen to collectivization of education, and the scientists and, first and foremost, paedologists were asked to develop a scientifically based theory of the collective. Methodological basis for its position was pedagogical theories about human behavior predetermined by heredity and environment. The first problem that needed solving was the definition of the term “collective”. One of the first, who gave a definition of the collective, was a famous Ukrainian paedologist Professor O. Zaluzhnyi. He emphasized that the scientific pedagogy as a science of organization of human behavior, puts two major problems: 1) the problem of purpose in pedagogy, that is a problem of the final product, which should be produced by pedagogues and society, 2) the problem of education and upbringing “of children’s material, which is the raw material in pedagogical production” [4, p. 64]. In other words, the first problem is we need someone to bring up and the second – how. This second problem, according to O. Zaluzhniy in scientific pedagogy and pedology is formulated as the problem of studying the behavior of the child and the collective. Note that in the mid-20th years there were many objections of the fact that the collective should be the center of the pedagogical searches as collectives, especially for children, according to many scientists, are not something constant, that the concept of the collective is uncertain, while understanding of the term individual is so certain that there is no doubt. However, O. Zaluzhny could build on the base of existing interpretations of the concept “collective”, which is often regarded as a living environment in which the child lives and develops. The definition of V. Bekhterev was known as: “A collective only then is the collective ... when due to the influence of one of its members on the other there is their unity in one way or another” [5, p. 85]. But in this definition the paedologists saw a number of disadvantages, in particular they had a doubt as for the term “the

unity”, which is defined as a mutual or collective communication. Moreover, in their view, this definition will be carried to a lot of subjectivity, since in practical work with children’s collective it is difficult to establish where there is a collective, where there is unity and where there is nothing of it. At that time the term “collective” does not occur in the works of all researchers. Many of them instead of the term “collective” use the term “aggregate”, “society”, “social units”, “crowd”, etc. But in fact it was the same phenomenon as a common feature, which sociologists included in the definition of the team was a relationship and interaction of its members. Discrepancy only began when it was about what should be understood by the interaction. Some people understood it as mutual assistance, others – as not only mutual assistance, but fighting and generally any interaction.

O. Zaluzhniy also believed that at the base of every collective is interaction of its members. But he is not satisfied with this definition and puts a question on interrelation that can be considered enough for a collective to exist. Solution of this problem will help to overcome the subjectivity in the definition of the collective, due to various understanding of mutual assistance, wrestling and other processes that make up the concept of “interrelation”. Scientist came to conclusion that collective need not be determined by the content but by the organizational basis. “The collective’s life begins only there – he wrote – where the interaction between different individuals is so strongly expressed that it leads to a collective response, that is, where a group of people starts to react to certain irritants together to represent a single organism”. At the same time O. Zaluzhny emphasized that collective is nothing else but the actual living organism. The collective cannot be understood, if not consider it as a system of effective activities, insisted the Marxists. Still there was no answer to the question: when is such a system formed? Responding to it O. Zaluzhny again appealed to the definitions of the collective which at that time existed in the works of other scholars. In particular, Bekhterev drew attention of O. Zaluzhny that in relation to the collective sometimes the term “crowd” is used. So, speaking of casual gatherings, he said: “It is enough that someone addressed the casual get-togethers, which prompted him to do with the public or other work,

instilled the same mood or desire, and random get-togethers become a collective person or team that can manifest itself as integer. So there is a crowd” [5, p. 82]

This logic did not suit O. Zaluzhny because behind it everything that falls under the understanding of crowd can be applied to the association, which is called the collective. So he tried to find some objective factor, that would be the grounds to call a group of people a collective. At the same time he took into consideration the views of a known paedologist V. Bekhterev who warned about the relationship, which can lead to hostility and disunity, and even to the complete destruction of any connection. One can hardly talk about the collective, V. Bekhterev believed, in the case of “a fight between two individuals, and yet it is obvious interaction”. O. Zaluzhny also opposed the unification of the collective and society. M. Bukharin’s view was the reason for this. Bukharin drew attention to two points. First, he believed that society is the most extensive system of interactions that cover the entire duration of the interaction between people, and secondly, there are other, narrower systems (classes, groups, parties, etc.) in a society. Considering that society was based on interaction, according to M. Bukharin, forms of which are very common, O. Zaluzhnyi concluded that such forms of interaction are only suitable for the determination of society, but are not suitable for determining a narrower collective. To substantiate this definition, which can be used to practice in the study of the behavior of a group of children, O. Zaluzhnyi applied reflectory approach. Scientist believed that all collective actions as well as actions of individuals are caused by various stimuli externally or internally. These irritants act separately on different fields in the behavior of different individuals. But in some cases, individual irritants or their whole system, acting in a more or less long term, begin to cause aggregate reactions in many individuals. Then there appears the unity in the behavior of these individuals that could be called the aggregate reaction. Therefore paedologist concludes that the presence of aggregate reactions if consider only reaction steps shown during movement, but in other forms (speech, facial expressions, etc.), and it is only objective sign of the collective whatever its form is, direction of behavior, since its establishment, etc. O. Zaluzhnyi was convinced that a lot of confusion was

made by scientists in the question of collectives (we have in mind, first of all, what is called its “soul”). From the point of view of the scientist only collective behavior could be studied, but not its excitement, the laws that govern this behavior. The collective reaction needs studying in order to establish laws to which they subordinate. That is why, O. Zaluzhnyi believed only reflex approach can be effective in the study of collective, as only such balance gives opportunity to use objective methods of research. From a reflexological point of view, can be studied only collective response depending on those or other stimuli can be studied. Thus, his definition of collective O. Zaluzhnyi tried to base only on objective observation data that are devoid of any psychology and subjectivity. Scholar has identified three of its main features: 1) interaction, 2) the effect of a common irritant or their entire system; 3) collective reaction. Such reasoning of O. Zaluzhnyi formed the basis of the following definition that was perceived by many scholars as a classic at the second stage: “The collective is an interactive group of people who collectively respond to a particular irritant or their total system” [6, p. 22]. As we can see, the position of reflexology on individual and collective behavior as a reaction to certain stimuli in determining the nature of a group of children has become a reference for methodology of O. Zaluzhnyi. The educational potential of a group of children, problems of its formation and development have remained out of view of the researcher. Note that in the second half of 20th – early 30-s another definition of the collective was widespread. It was developed by scientists-paedologists and based on psychological aspects of its functioning.

O. Zaluzhnyi paid attention to the differences between individualistic and collectivist pedagogy. The first, according to O. Zaluzhnyi, has a child as its main object of study, because it can be based on physiology, biology, psychology, but did not consider sociology. The second is the central object of study and has a collective impact, because it cannot help to look for a social base. A. Zaluzhnyi was one of the first in Ukraine to raise the question of the collective development. He repeatedly stressed that inherently human collective, in contrast to most groups of animals, are very dynamic and diverse. Therefore, we can only study them in a

dynamic way to change, transformation, in their origin and decay. But not to lose in various forms, you must have a classification that would allow each group to take one or other related type. It is necessary, scientist believed, that any collective property has been found, which can be identified by purely objective observation, and as a basis for classification.

O. Zaluzhnyi puts his working classification of children's collectives. First, he identifies self-induced and organized groups and he distinguishes 5 types of them:

1) Self-induced short, 2) self-induced long-lasting 3) organized and short-lived, 4) organized and long-lived simple 5) organized and long-lived complicated. Classification by O. Zaluzhnyi was not considered ideal, the only correct one and complete. Even the author himself believed his classification "suffered primarily in that it did not reflect the dynamics of the phenomena with which it has to deal". Being guided by it, it is often difficult to determine to what type of, for example, a school group – the fourth or fifth belongs, because between them there are transitional groups. And quite often, starting to learn a simple long-organized collective, you find that it has small collectives, it should therefore be regarded as a collective complex. Yet, this classification was important for further practical work with teams [7, p. 355]. Primary sources of Ukrainian pedagogy are little-known. A large number of applied research of O. Zaluzhnyi was devoted to sociality of a young child, childhood's social orientation of school-age children groups and collectives, not to mention a number of studies on the general development of children's interests, school performance, motivation in school collectives, etc. page 35.

O. Zaluzhnyi considered it important to understand the laws of the collective to open the basic forces shaping the collective, the main forces that guide behavior of this collective this or that way and the individuals in it, the forces that determine the internal struggle that often puts an end to the collective [7, p. 344].

Little-known primary sources Ukrainian Education (pm The nineteenth and twentieth centuries.): Readings / Compilation.: L. D Berezovsky, etc. – K.: Naukovyi svit, 2003. – 418 p.). Consideration of views on the collective upbringing of other

famous pedagogues who engaged in the development of the theory of collective upbringing in the 20 years of the twentieth century, requires further study.

References

1. **Zotin M.** Third All-Ukrainian Conference on Teacher Education / M. Zotin // The Way of enlightenment. – 1924. – № 10. – P. 162 – 173.
2. **Giy A.** Second All-Ukrainian session / A. Giy // The Way of education. – 1924. – № 5. – P. 119 – 123.
3. **Sokolyansky I.** Dytyachyi rukh – sotsial'ne bykhovannya [Children's movement is social upbringing] / I. Sokolyansky // Work of education. – 1923. – № 1. – P. 15 – 19.
4. **Zaluzhnyi O.** Metod testiv u nashiy shkoli [Method of testing in our school] / A. Zaluzhnyi // The Way of education. – 1925. – № 1. – P. 63 – 85.
5. **Bekhterev V. M.** Kolektyvna refleksologiya [Collective reflexology] / V. M. Bekhterev. – Petrograd : Kolos, 1921. – P. 432.
6. **Zaluzhnyi A.** Dytyachyi kolektyv i dytyna [Children collective and child] / A. Zaluzhnyi, S. Lozinski. – Kharkov : Knigospilka 1926. – P. 235.
7. **Little-known** primary sources Ukrainian pedagogy (second half of XIX – XX centuries) : Readings / Comp. LD Berezovskaja etc. – M. : The world, 2003. – P. 418.

Петришен О. Г.

О. Залужний про сутність колективного виховання дітей

У статті розглядається питання теорії колективного виховання у творчій спадщині О. Залужного у 20-х роках ХХ століття.

Зазначено, що методологічним орієнтиром для О. Залужного при визначенні сутності дитячого колективу стало положення рефлексології про поведінку особистості й колективу як реакцію на певні подразнення. Однак, поза увагою дослідника залишився виховний потенціал дитячого колективу, проблеми його формування й розвитку.

Зауважено, що в другій половині 20-х – на початку 30-х років більш відомим було визначення колективу, обґрунтоване вченими-педологами, в якому були зафіксовані психологічні аспекти його функціонування.

В статті наголошено на тому, що вчений приділяв увагу питанню різниці між індивідуалістичною і колективістичною педагогікою. Відомо, що одним із перших в Україні, хто поставив питання про розвиток колективу, був О. Залужний. Потрібно, вважав він, знайти яку-небудь властивість колективу, яку можливо було б виявити шляхом чисто об'єктивного спостереження, і її покласти в основу класифікації. Подано робочу класифікацію дитячих колективів О. Залужного.

Ключові слова: колектив, виховання, рефлексологія, освіта, колективна реакція.

Петришен Е. Г

А. Залужный про сущность коллективного воспитания детей

В статье рассматривается вопрос теории коллективного воспитания в творческом наследии А. Залужного в 20-х годах XX века.

Указано, что методологическим ориентиром для А. Залужного при определении сущности детского коллектива стало положение рефлексологии о поведении личности и коллектива как реакция на определенные раздражители. Однако вне внимания исследователя остался воспитательный потенциал детского коллектива, проблемы его формирования и развития.

Замечено, что во второй половине 20-х – в начале 30-х годов более известным было определение коллектива обоснованное учеными-педологами, в котором были зафиксированы психологические аспекты его функционирования.

В статье подчеркивается, что ученый уделял внимание вопросу разницы индивидуалистической и коллективной педагогике. Известно, что одним из первых в Украине, кто поставил вопрос о развитии коллектива, был А. Залужный. Необходимо, считал он, найти какую-нибудь особенность коллектива, которую можно было бы выявлять путем объективного наблюдения и ее положить в основу классификации. Рассмотрена рабочая классификация детских коллективов А. Залужного.

Ключевые слова: коллектив, воспитание, рефлексология, образование, коллективная реакция.

Information about the author

Olena Gennadiievna Petrishen – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of Language Training Department of Donbass State Technical University.

The article was received by the Editorial Office on 25.03.2013

The article was put into print on 26.04.2013