

Herasymenko L. V.

**FREEDOM AS THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF THE ORGANIZATION OF
EDUCATIONAL PROCESS IN P. KAPTEREV'S DIDACTICS**

The focal point in the ongoing process of democratic changes is Man, which is the concept including a number of issues the most important of which are education and pedagogy. Understanding the methodological orientation of education as the strategy for developing the individual and providing for his/her growth requires from that the pedagogical theory and practice concentrate on rethinking the human inner nature, creating humane relations in the educational settings, and working out the corresponding principles of and conditions for the educational process organization. To certain extent, these tasks are being realized within the main directions of the education system modernization, namely differentiation, individualization, life-long education, humanization and humanitarization, which are declared in the main acts of the Bologna Process and are seen as the basic demands of the 21st Century. These modern trends can be traced back to the past, which should be carefully studied to understand the present, be able to objectively evaluate it, draw the corresponding analogies and distinguish the effective conditions for organizing the educational process in modern schools. Therefore, the analysis of the humanistic concept of the outstanding educator of the second half of the 19th Century and the beginning of the 20th Century P. Kapterev is of great importance and scientific interest.

Extolling freedom as the fundamental principle of the educational process organization was truly earned from the scholar's experience. His every step in the academia is consistent and logical in asserting the human right for self-development and perfection, faithfulness to one's own humanistic ideals and life values: respect for Man, recognition of the right for freedom, self-identification, belief in the possibility of human nature change for better.

The attitude to the educational legacy of the scholar was not univocal. The historiographical research focusing on his works demonstrates:

– the views determined by the ideology of a socialist country (M. Dadyenkov, F. Korol'ov, Ye. Medyns'ky, O. Pinkevych) in which P. Kapterev was represented as the disciple of liberal and bourgeois ideology, the opponent of the revolutionary reforms in the society, the supporter of the education free from politics; as a result, his works were not studied for a long period of time; and

– the objective analysis of P. Kapterev's contribution to educational psychology by B. Anan'yev, S. Vynokurov, Sh. Hanelin, A. Hol'dina, L. Zavarzina, P. Kuzmin, P. Lebedyev, V. Slastyenin, and Z. Tambiyeva. These scholars emphasized that P. Kapterev's didactics was well-grounded, anthropologically- and humanistically-oriented. Many of his ideas were highly appreciated, including the substantiation of the concept of the comprehensive educational process; the attempts to individualize and differentiate education; create conditions for the free selection of courses by students in accord with their interests and capabilities; reform the traditional system of teaching based on classes and grades in order to defy the focus on an average student; the introduction of active teaching methods promoting students' independence and conscious research activity.

Despite active research into the pedagogical legacy of P. Kapterev conducted in the 20th Century, the principles of the organization of the educational process introduced by the scholar, which actually are the basics of his didactic concept, have not been thoroughly analyzed. Therefore, the aim of this article is to throw the light upon the principle of freedom as the basis for the humanization and democratization of the didactics of P. Kapterev.

The main notion of the didactics of the scholar is the notion of the educational process, which was defined by him in one of the basic works *Pedahohichny protses* (*The Educational Process*), published in 1905. This book was the very first attempt in the national and world pedagogy to represent learning as a comprehensive process aimed at the well-rounded development of the individual on the basis of the natural self-development of the individual to the extent of his/her ability and in accordance to

the social ideal. The scholar declares freedom to be the basic principle of the educational process organization. P. Kapterev conducted a profound analysis of the understanding of freedom by other scholars of the 19th Century. The roots of the idea of non-interference in the process of learning were found in the works of D. Pisarev, who, in his article *Zhinochi tpy*, 1861 (*Women Types*), opposes compulsion of or any active interventions for a child in the process of education. The idea of freedom was further supported and developed by L. Tolstoy, who defined it as the most important principle of his educational system. P. Kapterev did not agree with D. Pisarev and L. Tolstoy on the total elimination of the adult control and giving children absolute freedom. P. Kapterev ironically describes L. Tolstoy's speculations about "free school": "Everyone makes mistakes, I am the one who knows the truth and will reveal it to the world. There is only one God, and Tolstoy is its prophet concerning the educational issues [5, p. 73]".

P. Kapterev's contemporary S. Myropolsky understood freedom differently. He believed that true freedom is self-restriction, conscious submission of one's will to God's moral law. On the other hand, P. Kapterev stressed every individual's right for freedom: "Freedom of every living being is realized through acting independently, in a manner conforming with its own nature without any external compulsion [3, p. 308]".

Proceeding from anthropological principles, P. Kapterev was aware of various influences that are activated in the educational process: national traditions, religion, social ideals, etc., which makes absolute freedom of a child impossible. The scholar was able to prove that it was impossible to organize the educational process without consideration of certain factors and guided exclusively by the wishes of students.

P. Kapterev believed that freedom in educational process was necessary to allow every individual to show his/her "spiritual face", live and grow as an individual in accord with his/her own nature, but not with the generally accepted standards. In this context, ensuring equal opportunities for the children from different strata of the society was one of the topical issues for the end of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th Centuries. That was the time when many educators-humanists were fighting for

equal opportunities in education and a number of state acts and decrees were aimed at depriving the children from underprivileged segments of the society of the opportunity to get education. This restricted their right for self-improvement. On June 18, 1887, a circular on “cookwomen’s children” was signed by the Minister of Education I. Delyanov, which would limit the admittance of children of people of lower classes to the gymnasiums and primary schools with the exception of the most gifted ones: “In this way, educational establishments will be free from the children of coachmen, lackeys, cooks, laundresses, petty merchants with the possible exceptions for those endowed with extraordinary abilities, – all those who should not altogether be taken out the environment they belong to. Otherwise, as experience shows, they will become disrespectful of their own parents, dissatisfied with their everyday life, irritated about the existing and unavoidable disparity in wealth [11, p. 35]”. This led to a significant decrease in the number of students from the poorest town-dwellers and villagers receiving classical education. Referring to *The historical review of the ministry of education activity in 1802 – 1902* prepared by S. Rozhdestvenky, P. Kapterev provided the following examples: in 1881 47.5% of students came from the nobles and clerks, while in 1894 their number grew to 56.3%. On the contrary, the number of gymnasium students from poorer classes diminished from 37.2% in 1881 to 31.7% in 1894, while the number of those from villages decreased from 8% in 1881 to 6% 1894 [5, p. 405].

In 1896, the Chief Prosecutor of the Holy Synod K. Pobyedonostsev stated his view of the problems of education in *Moskovsky sbornik (The Moscow Collection)*. He suggested that the school should not separate the child from his/her natural environment and deprive the family of workforce, as well as put foolish and senseless ideas and hopes into the heads of the underprivileged segment of the society. A statement like that publicly made by the famous civil servant and figure, deepened the gap between different classes in the society and limited the access to education for the ordinary people in the Russian Empire. P. Kapterev, a humanist, could not sit idle in these circumstances. He put forward a progressive for his times idea of classless education closely related to introducing democratic relations and freedom of

the educational process. P. Kapterev, as well as V. Stoyunin, was confident that the stratification of the society separated people and encouraged hostility, suppressed civil interests and feelings. P. Kapterev believed that the development of civic consciousness was the main task of the educational process. Its fulfillment was predicated by the scholar on the introduction of the principle of freedom into the educational process and the assertion of equal rights for all people: “Schools, just like hospitals, pedagogy, just like medicine, should be accessible to all strata of the society and should not change depending on their differences [3, p. 211]”.

The scholar did not share the views of P. Yurkevych on upbringing and teaching poor people, who stressed that education should discipline the mind and anchor it to a few, but firm beliefs, since children of poorer people had neither time nor means for deep internal education [10]. P. Kapterev believed in the possibility of educating children from various strata of the society and emphasized that they could only be grouped in accord with their interests and capabilities. The requirement for classless education in the didactics of the researcher was secondary to the principle of freedom, guaranteed the accessibility of education to children from different classes of the society, and provided for equal opportunities for every individual’s growth.

In the didactics of P. Kapterev, the realization of the principle of freedom was stimulated by the autonomy of the educational process. The autonomy was defined as freeing the educational process from the external influences of the state and the church and necessitated by the demands of the pedagogy of that time and the peculiarities of organizing the educational process in the second half of the 19th Century: “... neither the state nor the church can directly help children and the youth develop naturally and grow as individuals, since this is not their task [6, p. 22]”. This was the reason that P. Kapterev differentiated between the society and the state, religiousness and the church. He recognized the importance of upbringing spiritual citizens devoted to the state and the church, but protected from the total bureaucratic rule and dogmatic influence of these social institutions on schooling.

The demand for the autonomy of the educational process gave rise to the development of the scholarly or, even more so, ideological discussion, which

remained active in the 20th Century as well. For instance, at the beginning of the 20th Century, Ye. Medynskyy criticized autonomy, relating it to “the lack of political commitment in education”, which he believed was the sign of P. Kapterev’s bourgeois principles. Z. Tambiyeva, the author of the first dissertation on P. Kapterev’s didactics, saw his contribution into education as positive. In one of her articles *Dydaktychni pohlady P. Kapteryeva*, 1964 (*P. Kapterev’s Didactic Views*), she, however, stated that “in the times of the Soviet rule, P. Kapterev took the wrong stand on school management by the state. He did not realize how sharp the turn in the world history was, failed to acknowledge the role of the proletarian state in the transformations in various spheres of life and activity of the Soviet Republic; on the contrary, he continued to assert the autonomy of the school, the independence of the educational process from the policy of the Communist Party and the Workers and Peasants’ Government [9, p. 124]. L. Zavarzina, the 21st Century scholar, who analyzed P. Kapterev’s legacy of the last years of his life, supports the views of the researchers of the 20th Century, labeling autonomy as “a harmful utopia, which finds numerous followers even nowadays [2, p. 76]”. To understand the essence of P. Kapterev’s autonomy, it is necessary to eliminate the ideological context and study his views in the historical context of the 19th Century.

In his analysis of “the new pedagogy”, P. Kapterev refers to I. Skvortsov’s article *Svoboda shkoly* (*The Freedom of School*) published in 1862 in the September Issue of *Yasnaya polyana* (*The Bright Glade Journal*). This article emphasized, among other things, that the greatest harm to school education is done by the state, which turns it into “an administrative institution where education leads to positions and profitable places creating the bureaucratic pedagogy and teachers-bureaucrats unaware of the true nature of education [5, p. 103]”. The scholar I. Skvortsov was the first to state the need for the autonomy of education from the state. He persuasively argued that the basis of education (science and humanism) was the same for all people, irrespective of the state they lived in. Therefore, education should be above politics. Emphasizing the significance of the scholar’s views on the issue, P. Kapterev referred to them as “the voice of the breaking heart, rubbing the salt into the wound

of the education in Russia [5, p. 160]”. Dwelling on the ideas of I. Skvortsov in his article *Pro suspil’ni zadachi osvity*, 1892 (*On the Civic Tasks of Education*), P. Kapterev clearly defined the expectations of the state with regard to the school. The scholar believed that the educational process in the schools of that time did not have any significance on its own, but was rather the means of satisfying the state’s needs. The state overrode education completely, sometimes forcing it into fighting with the social phenomena that it saw as unacceptable. The researcher maintained that the state was indifferent to the child’s development and the harmonious growth of the individual. The state was interested in discipline, loyalty to the existing political system, and the political reliability of the citizens. P. Kapterev shared V. Stoyunin’s belief in the negative influence the state had on the educational process. In his article *Zamitky pro rosiysku shkolu*, 1860 (*Notes on Russian School*) P. Kapterev wrote “... the state can only oppress the school’s development and never direct it towards the true goals, because it has neither power nor means to assess the pedagogical art [8, p. 175]”. V. Stoyunin suggested that the laws introduced to schools by the state contradicted the essence of education. P. Kapterev was also convinced that the only laws that should govern the educational process were the laws of child’s development: “The educational process should never be oriented to strengthening the parochial ideals of certain political party; it should be remembered that building religious, political, and social beliefs is something that should be done when the person is mature, which is definitely above school age [10, p. 207]”. Therefore, all priorities of the state do not go along with the main task of the pedagogical process – students’ personal growth.

The views of this kind were not generally accepted. The editor of *Russkaya shkola* (*The Russian School Journal*) Ya. Hurevych did not agree with P. Kapterev’s thesis that the state was exclusively interested in the specialized training of the youth rather than in the development of the mind and interest of the students [8, p. 67]”. Ya. Hurevych called the arguments of P. Kapterev groundless, since they were not based on the analysis of the decrees and documents concerning education. To prove his point of view, the editor referred to the document *Pravyla provedennyya*

vyprobuvan' dlya klasychnykh himnazyi, March 12, 1891 (*The Rules on Conducting Exams for Classical Gymnasiums*), which stated that the examiner should first of all pay attention to the quality of the student's knowledge and his/her overall development, as well as his/her capabilities and interest in work [8, p. 69].

The study of the publications in the periodicals of the 1880s – 1890s and the scholarly works of the educators of that time demonstrates that these Rules were just the solitary attempts of the state to show its interest in the child's inner world and development and could not solve the problem of state intrusion and its negative influence on the educational process.

P. Kapterev came to the conclusion that the only way to withstand the pressure of the state was the autonomy of the educational process. The scholar believed that the school was a self-governed institution: "...this is an organism that lives by its own efforts and means and does not depend on anything or anybody except for the laws it itself imposes [6, p. 313]". Advancing the idea of education without politics in one of his articles, *Pedahohika i polityka*, 1921 (*Pedagogy and Politics*), P. Kapterev also asserted that every political party was concerned about the realization of its own interests, having the general public and the youth serve these interests. The scholar believed it was unacceptable because it would lead to the one-sided development of the attitudes and beliefs, which hinders the well-rounded growth of the individual: "The school is not a political parties' sycophant, it is above them all and is grounded on the eternal laws of the human body development. The political squabble should never be part of its life, since the school has its own true, eternal god – the science of human nature and development – it should serve to and worship; praying to political idols, which are offered sacrifices today and will be thrown in mud and trampled down or hurled into the stove and burnt tomorrow, is unworthy of a teacher [1, p. 212]. The scholar was firmly convinced that pedagogy in general is apolitical, because for politicians "the personality is nothing", whereas for the teacher it is sacred. As a balanced and staunch humanist, P. Kapterev did not try to isolate children from the society and did not deny their right to be active participants of the social life, but rather stressed the importance of taking into consideration the

students' age and creating conditions for the conscious choice of their ways and attitudes. Student's consciousness, the scholar believed, should be free and able to critically dwell on the political slogans and programs, and do so objectively on the basis of the knowledge on social sciences acquired at school.

P. Kapterev distinguished two forms of school's autonomy, such as:

- democratic, when the school is governed by the school council, the members of which are equal in selecting teachers, administration, introducing school rules, spending school funds, etc. In this kind of autonomy, the teacher is bound up in the school, takes to heart its successes or failures, and tries to implement various approaches to help it flourish; and

- oligarchic, or partial, when the school is managed by the board consisting of several elective members from various corporations, parents association, city and Zemstvo government, and school administration. They deal with various school issues, except "purely educational", which are related to the content or methods of teaching [6].

The scholar stated that democratic autonomy is more desirable, since it is conducive to creating conditions necessary for the free growth and development of students.

Therefore, autonomy in P. Kapterev's didactics was a critical condition for spreading democratic tendencies, freedom and diminishing bureaucratic influence upon the school and educational process.

The autonomous educational process meant the introduction of democratic relations between its participants, when one's "ego" can harmoniously cooperate with another's "ego": teachers' vs. students', students' vs. parents', parents' vs. teachers', administration's vs. teachers', etc. Restricting the students' freedom, numerous orders and rules cause significant inconvenience and hinder students' proper development. P. Kapterev asserted in this regard that it was necessary to build such conditions in which a child was able to make his/her own choice and, in this way, "create himself/herself". Parents and teachers had to direct students in the process of their self-development. It is important to point out that P. Kapterev offered a systemic

approach to freedom in the educational process and in developing a free individual: “A person who has neither free will nor free consciousness is not able to develop free will and free consciousness in students... It is impossible to give something to others you yourself do not have. Free school cannot be free for students and not free for the teacher, since students and teachers are inseparably connected and one-sided freedom is unattainable...” [4, p. 17]. Hence, the scholar emphasized the need for the teacher to understand his own freedom as the foundation for building the democratic relations with students. The awareness of one’s self-sufficiency and value, respect for the student are the driving force of creating such system of relations.

P. Kapterev stated that the true sign of freedom is the eradication of compulsion, which reigned in the education of the Russian empire of that time. Supporting the P. Yurkevych’s idea that the awareness of “the beauty of learning”, of the duty that dominates over the instincts and desires and not compulsion should be the basis of learning, P. Kapterev substantiated the need for the introduction of a free component of learning, which could motivate the creative development of the individual. The elective part of the educational process can function properly only if the individual make-up of every student is known and the conditions for the realization of their motives, cognitive interests, opportunities and capabilities, as well as the development of responsibility and will, have been created. “Every individual is an incurable subjectivist, having his/her own character, taste, organs of perception, health problems and illnesses, mind, memory, and imagination [3, p. 411]. Taking the above-mentioned into consideration, P. Kapterev recommended the development of more flexible curricula, which would allow for the adjustment in the content of the educational process in accordance with the social and economic profile of the region and the potential and interests of the students. The free component in schooling must be realized through a system of electives, which would help children to satisfy their interests and stimulate their development. It can also be encouraged by means of introducing furcations (specialization to allow students to enhance their knowledge of certain disciplines and provide for the right choice of the future career by means of

gradual development of the students' capabilities in humanities, natural, technical or economic sciences.

Therefore, recognizing the influence of the society and the state on the educational process, P. Kapterev urged the independence of the latter from the state's bureaucracy and formalism and the dogmatic influence of the church. He maintained that only those influences could be allowed which encouraged students' growth and development. The scholar tried to warn the society of the excessive enthusiasm about politics, stress the importance of developing a free, active, and accomplished individual capable of life-long improvement and ready to defend his/her civil beliefs.

P. Kapterev's contribution is of great modern relevance. The fights of political parties for power during elections affect both educators and students. Students are forced to participate in the rallies to support the candidates of some political parties and distribute campaign leaflets; campaign materials with the political party symbols are spread among school children and parents. The local government agencies continue to brutally interfere in the school life: close down schools, fire teachers, and require numerous reports on the progress, moral development, work with gifted students, etc., which significantly formalizes the educational efforts of the school proper. Therefore, the study of Kapterev's legacy gives us the opportunity to learn from history in order to avoid mistakes in the future and develop the effective ways of reforming the modern system of education on the grounds of humanism, freedom, and democracy.

References

1. **Antologiya** gumannoy pedagogiki. Kapterev [Humane Pedagogy Anthology. Kapterev]. Moscow: Izdatelsky dom Shalvy Amonashvili. 2001. 224 p. (rus)
2. **Zavarzina L. Ye.** P. F. Kapterev ob avtonomnosti pedagogicheskogo protsessa [P. F. Kapterev on Autonomy of Educational Process]. *Pedagogika*. 2010. No. 4. Pp. 69 – 79. (rus)

3. **Каптерев П. Ф.** Izbrannyye pedagogicheskiye sochineniya [Selected Pedagogical Works]. Moscow: Pedagogika. 1982. 704 p. (rus)
4. **Каптерев П. Ф.** L. N. Tolstoy i sovremennoye preobrazovaniye shkoly [L. N. Tolstoy and Current School Reform]. *Pedagogicheskaya mysl'*. 1919. No. 1 – 3. Pp. 1 – 18. (rus)
5. **Каптерев П. Ф.** Novaya russkaya pedagogiya, yeye glavneyshyye idei, napravleniya i deyateli [New Russian Pedagogy: Main Ideas, Trends and Representatives]. St. Petersburg. 1914. 212 p. (rus)
6. **Каптерев П. Ф.** Novaya shkola v novoy Rossii [New School in New Russia]. *Pedagogichesky sbornik*. 1917. No. 10 – 11. Pp. 307 – 349. (rus)
7. **Каптерев П. Ф.** Ob obshchestvennykh zadachakh obrazovaniya [On Civil Tasks of Education]. *Russkaya Shkola*. 1892. No. 1. Pp. 55 – 72. (rus)
8. **Стойунин В. Я.** Izbrannyye pedagogicheskiye sochineniya [Selected Pedagogical Works]. Moscow: Pedagogika. 1991. 368 p. (rus)
9. **Тамбиева З. М.** Didakticheskiye vzglyady P. F. Kaptereva [P. F. Kapterev's Didactic Views]. *Sovetskaya pedagogika*. 1964. No. 3. Pp. 122 – 134.
10. **Юркевич П. Д.** Kurs obshchey pedagogiki s prilozheniyami [The Course of General Pedagogy with Supplements]. Moscow. 1869. 404 p. (rus)
11. **Тсентралны Дерзхавны Иstoryчны Архив міста Києв.** Popechitelya Kiyevskogo uchebnogo okruga. Tsyrkulyarnyye rasporyazheniya ministra narodnogo obrazovaniya [Kyiv Central State Archives. Kyiv Educational District. Circular Orders of the Minister of Education]. 1881. F. 707, op. 87, d. 6759. 81 p. (rus)

Герасименко Л. В. Свобода як основоположний принцип організації педагогічного процесу в дидактиці П. Каптерева

Стаття розкриває історичні корені виникнення принципу свободи як підґрунтя педагогічного процесу, що пов'язано з гуманізацією й демократизацією шкільного життя. У статті розглянуто гуманістичну теорію видатного вітчизняного педагога й психолога другої половини ХІХ – початку

XX ст. П. Каптерева, в основу якої покладена ідея саморозвитку особистості учня в процесі навчально-виховної діяльності. Схарактеризовано принцип свободи як основоположний принцип у науковій концепції вченого, який обґрунтовує необхідність автономності школи й педагогічного процесу, свободи суб'єктів навчання, демократизації їхніх стосунків.

Розглянуто способи реалізації принципу свободи в організації навчання: упровадження вільного компонента у зміст навчання (система факультативних занять за вибором школярів), а також фірмаций, спрямованих індивідуалізувати навчання й задовольнити інтереси й потреби учнів. Теорія вченого розглянута в контексті гуманістичних поглядів представників прогресивної педагогіки зазначеного періоду: Я. Гуревича, С. Миропольського, М. Пирогова, В. Стоюніна, Л. Толстого, П. Юркевича.

Ключові слова: принцип свободи, педагогічний процес, автономність педагогічного процесу.

Герасименко Л. В. Свобода как основополагающий принцип организации педагогического процесса в дидактике П. Каптерева

Статья раскрывает исторические корни возникновения принципа свободы педагогического процесса, связанного с гуманизацией и демократизацией школьной жизни. В статье рассматривается гуманистическая теория выдающегося отечественного педагога и психолога второй половины XIX – начала XX века П. Каптерева, в основу которой положена идея саморазвития личности ученика в процессе учебно-воспитательной деятельности. Охарактеризован принцип свободы как основополагающий принцип в научной концепции ученого, который обосновывает необходимость автономности школы и педагогического процесса, свободы субъектов обучения, демократизации их отношений.

Рассмотрены практические способы реализации свободы в организации обучения: внедрение свободного компонента в содержание обучения (система факультативных занятий по выбору учеников), а также фирмации,

направленные на индивидуализацию обучения и реализацию интересов и потребностей учеников. Теория ученого рассматривается в контексте гуманистических взглядов представителей прогрессивной педагогики отмеченного периода: Я. Гуревича, С. Миропольского, Н. Пирогова, В. Стоюнина, Л. Толстого, П. Юркевича.

Ключевые слова: принцип свободы, педагогический процесс, автономия педагогического процесса.

Herasymenko L. V. Freedom as the Basic Principle of the Organization of Educational Process in P. Kapterev's Didactics

The article reveals the historical roots of the emergence of the principle of freedom as the foundation of the pedagogical process connected with the humanization and democratization of schooling. In this regard, the author analyses the humanistic theory of P. Kapterev, an outstanding national educator and psychologist of the second half of the 19th – early 20th Centuries, which is based on the idea of self-development of student's personality in the educational process. Special attention is given to the principle of freedom as the fundamental principle of the scholar's scientific approach, which justifies the necessity to ensure the autonomy of the school and the educational process, students' freedom, and the democratization of their relationship.

The following practical ways of the realization of the principle of freedom in the organization of the education are considered: freedom in the content of education was assured by a system of electives offered to students, whereas the individualization of education, the consideration of students' interests and needs were realized through furcations. The educator's theory is examined in the context of the humanistic views of the representatives of the progressive pedagogy developed during the period under consideration: Ya. Hurevych, S. Myropolsky, N. Pirogov, V. Stoyunin, L. Tolstoy, P. Yurkevych.

Key words: principle of freedom, educational process, autonomy of educational process.

The article was received by the Editorial Office on 25.06.2013

The article was put into print on 01.11.2013

Peer review: Savchenko S. V., Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor