



Family Education in the Scientific Heritage of Kazan University's Scientists

A. S. Khakimzianova¹ and E. A. Senchenkova²

Kazan Federal University, Department of Education, Kazan, Russia

*E-mail:*¹<alsoukh@mail.ru>, ²<ek-senchenkova@mail.ru>

KEYWORDS Language. Modern Family. National Culture. Physical Education. Socio-political Condition

ABSTRACT The present paper proposes a comparative analysis of the pedagogical views on family education of such world outstanding personalities, who lived and worked at the Kazan University of Russia during recent centuries. It justifies that not only the education but their concepts of the family are of particular interest, respecting the challenges that modern education and modern family face nowadays. Both physical and moral education of a healthy new generation is a challenging and essential task for the modern community. Currently, there is a particular need for a precise study of the theory and practice of education and training in the changed socio-political and economic conditions and at the revival period of the national culture, language, historical roots of people with the focus on the scientific and cultural heritage.

INTRODUCTION

The commencement of the new millennium was characterized by the reform of all life aspects of our society. A comprehensive modernization process is in progress at present, which deals with all aspects - from economic, state, and political reforms to restructuring of all social institutions, religion, family, and the education system at all levels, particularly the higher levels (Troshin 1915; Kataeva et al. 2015; Babintsev et al. 2016; Tikhonova 2017; Khovanskaya et al. 2017).

Crisis or disintegration of the family can be assigned to one of the most severe problems in the spiritual sphere, which proceeds to advance in modern Russian society, along with such negative phenomena as the devaluation of traditional values, drug addiction, crime, and sexual freedom (Lesgaft 1951; Vainer and Fahrutdinova 2016; Luchinskaya et al. 2018).

In the researchers' opinion, the importance of ascertaining methods to resolve these problems and the revival of family values is confirmed given that the family is traditionally considered the leading institution of education, where the foundation of personality is developed since a child is in the family for a significant part of his/her life. Both physical and moral education of a healthy new generation is a complicated and necessary task for modern society (Tolstoy 1911; Bekhterev 1927; Thompson 2016; Wolff 2017).

Currently, it is especially necessary to thoroughly investigate the issues of the theory and practice of education and training, concentrated

in the country's scientific and cultural heritage in the changed socio-political and economic conditions and during the revival of our own national culture, language, historical roots of the people (Sheregi and Aref'ev 2016; Inanç and Liew 2017; Vecco and Srakar 2018).

The accomplishment of Russian ideas about family education falls at the end of the XIX - beginning of the XX centuries. It was the time when the exploration of new methods of training children in the family was conducted. A significant role in the development of science and culture of Eastern Russia was played by Kazan University, which started in 1804, and instantly became the greatest center of social and pedagogical thought and had a significant impact on the emergence and development of advanced ideas of the time (Zakirova et al. 2016; Gromova et al. 2019).

Objectives

The present paper proposes a comparative analysis of the pedagogical views on family education of such world outstanding personalities, who lived and worked at the Kazan University of Russia during recent centuries.

METHODOLOGY

In the present study, the following theoretical methods of research were used: theoretical analysis and synthesis, comparative analysis,

abstraction and concretization, historical and logical ways.

The principal purpose of the study was to perform a comparative analysis of the pedagogical views on family education of such outstanding personalities, not only in the history of Kazan University such as - a prominent Russian anatomist, biologist, leading public figure and teacher, 1871; Lesgaft (Born: 1837; Died: 1909) - professor, head of the department of physiological anatomy of the University; Tolstoy (Born: 1828; Died: 1910) - a great Russian writer, corresponding member, honorary academician of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, who studied at Kazan University in 1844-1847; Bekhterev (Born: 1857; Died: 1927) - psychiatrist, neuropathologist, physiologist, psychologist, pedologist, founder of reflexology and pathopsychological direction in Russia, academician, who was a professor at Kazan University in 1885-1893 and head of the psychiatric clinic of the district clinic in Kazan; Troshin (Born: 1874; Died: 1938) - neuropathologist, psychologist, pedagogue, pedologist, who graduated from the medical faculty of the university, in 1918-1922 - professor, head of the department of psychiatry at Kazan University. The mentioned scientists, to a greater or lesser extent, addressed the basics of raising children in the family in the second half of the 19th century. Still, their viewpoints on pedagogy are of considerable interest to this day.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is imperative that the position of humanistic anthropocentrism was inherent to all the authors in question.

Lesgaft worked scientifically and propounded the fundamental concepts of family education. According to Lesgaft's definition (Lesgaft 1951; Van Manen 2016), the family life of a child takes seven years after birth, during which his/her type develops, customs and habits of the given locality and family are assimilated. Hence, this period considerably affects human life and leaves an almost indelible mark on his/her entire future existence (Lesgaft 1951; Van Manen 2016).

All the authors under investigation were supporters of the natural development of a child, particularly in the period of family upbringing. Therefore, Lesgaft considered the fundamental

components of the integrity of an individual, the unity of the general and the individual in humans, the plasticity of the nervous system, and the child's upbringing through developing the ideas of anthropology in pedagogy and forming a theory of family education (Guseva 2018). "The mystery of family education," wrote the scientist, "is to allow a child to develop himself, to do everything himself" (Gabdulchakov 2017).

The peculiarity of Lesgaft's concept (Lesgaft 1951) is the combination of the natural-scientific tradition with a pedagogical tradition, which has led to his selection of an approach to the development of a human model, which can be defined as the connection of the organism with the environment. Such a model, characteristic of natural sciences, is hugely productive concerning its implementation in the pedagogical tradition (Kapterev 1982; Fedorov and Tretyakova 2016). That leads to considering a person in harmony with the environment when the structure of which is determined by itself and also is a part of itself, which can be precisely traced in the features of the school types suggested by Lesgaft (Lesgaft 1951; Van Manen 2016). He considers the truthfulness and consciousness as the vital signs for singling out. These features revealed the social essence of man. Consequently, Lesgaft's human model is dialogical with the meaning that a person is observed via interaction with other people, which is following the modern perception of anthropological phenomena (Gabdulchakov 2017).

Furthermore, the combination of traditions allowed Lesgaft to develop an original concept of pedagogical cooperation (Lesgaft 1951), which was built based on the psychophysiological concept of surplus stimulus, which consists of the fact that after each action of the stimulus, the susceptibility to it is decreased, the meaning of which is that a more potent stimulus is required at any time to receive a response at the initial level. Accordingly, the scientist denied the advisability of punishments and rewards in the pedagogical process as impeding the preservation of a child's impressionability and formal pedagogical interaction. This provision is the most controversial in his legacy. There have been both followers and opponents for this scientist's hypothesis nowadays and in the history of pedagogy. The most significant fact for the

authors of the present paper is that Lesgaft attempted to make the pedagogical interaction conscious and humane using this approach and by relying on positive emotional reinforcement (Lesgaft 1951; Gabdulchakov 2017). Lesgaft (1951) transferred the center of gravity from the formal attributes of pedagogical interaction to absolute-moral and spiritual guidelines in his concept.

The scientist analyzed the pedagogical interaction in the process of individual development of humans based on the age-related approach for understanding the peculiarities of it, which allowed the scientists to single out three fundamental models of pedagogical interaction in the mentioned conception. The first model is characterized by pedagogical interaction according to the imitation principle, and the second model is a combined interaction when both imitation and conscious participation of teachers and children take place. The third model removes the main characteristics of the previous models and is defined by the presence of the collective subject of interaction, leading, and anticipation of the actions of other members of the collective subject of interaction. The idea of pedagogical interaction defined the specifics of Lesgaft's (1951) comprehension of the features of family, physical, mental, and moral upbringing, which are tightly interrelated in his system.

Lesgaft's (1951) concepts about the synthetic method of understanding of the essence of humankind, the humanistic basis of pedagogical interaction, and also conscious and active participation in the interaction of all its participants were caught by the tradition of the Russian pedagogical science. Lesgaft's opinions of family education and physical education were of particular significance for the further development of pedagogical science and practice, which were based on the idea of an energetic, rational, moral, and humane person.

As it was mentioned in recent studies, Lesgaft's (1951) concept is of particular and practical interest at present, when the purpose of modern Russian education is identified as the creating conditions for the full development and self-development of each child, which fosters the capacity of all children to analyze and make personal decisions (Gabdulchakov 2017). In this respect, Lesgaft's ideas about the activity of all

participants in pedagogical interaction are relevant, since nowadays the scientists and practitioners are conscious about the necessity to reorient the current education system from the formal knowledge to the personality-activity paradigm, which is developed based on integrating knowledge and human activities. In a specific educational process, that was manifested in a component in the content of education and in the forms of organization of the educational process, which involves the development of the potential for creative activity.

Currently, it is necessary not only to master knowledge and skills but as well to be able to productively and creatively use them in practice, and not just copy pre-set samples for the further development of society. The mentioned idea was embodied in the modern "strategy for the modernization of the content of education," in the primacy of interactive and communicative structures of teaching and educational activities and various workshops, that is what Lesgaft (1951) called for.

Accordingly, the concept of free education occupies a significant place in their pedagogical theory. Tolstoy (1911) confirmed the human right to develop beliefs and viewpoints freely, without any violence and coercion from society; Tolstoy believed that children are characterized by natural perfection and high moral qualities. A distinctive feature of Tolstoy compared to other scientists is that he denied the legitimacy and possibility of the conscious, purposeful educational influence of teachers and parents on children in idealizing the nature of children, in his doctrine of freedom in education (Ionova and Kot 2013).

Troshin (1915) continued the tradition of pedagogical anthropology of Ushinskiy (2004) and created an essential contribution to the development of the problem of investigating mentally disabled children. Troshin's work, "Anthropological basis of education," is fundamental in this respect. "Comparative psychology of normal and abnormal children" was published in 1915, which is recognized as applicable not only for the investigation of mentally disabled children but possesses direct relevance to various categories of children with developmental disabilities and normally growing children.

Troshin (1915) had high hopes on the still unused opportunities for upbringing, which he proposed to explore, more extensive investigating the physiological, psychological, and social nature of man, and considering the methods of development of children with deviations from humanistic positions.

Troshin (1915) argued that the stages of human development are generally repeated in the process of development of a child's psyche and personality approaching the problem from a medical perspective. It was seen that the compliance is the purpose of pedagogy and does not violate these corresponding patterns: "It is good to educate, therefore, to lead a child through the stages that he must pass; it is bad to teach to neglect the natural stages; to know a child means to determine the stage on which he is" (Troshin 1915). It is particularly significant and valuable to highlight that the scientist substantiated the statement about the general laws of development of normal children and also the children with deviations. "In essence, there is no difference between normal and abnormal children. Those and others are children; both develop according to one law..."

Troshin's viewpoint of the educational process at an early age was presented by Bekhterev (1927) in a study conducted in 1909 titled "Issues of Education in the Early Childhood." The author also highlighted the high importance of the period of family education in a person's life, when the health of the organism is created, the first pillars of the future personality, the main character traits, and the child's propensities. In the interrelation between family and public education, Bekhterev (1909) saw enormous reserves for the all-round development of the personality and the process of socialization. According to the scientist, it is necessary to form such a personality to develop natural abilities morally, physically, and mentally, and it is essential to encourage the development of talents.

As Lesgaft noted (Lesgaft 1951), children are more influenced by the behavior than the word. It is believed that a child repeats what he sees around him, which develops his habits and customs, and the type of child is formed under this influence.

Tolstoy also highlighted similar problems (Tolstoy 1911; Robertson 2016). He described

the hypocrisy of parents before children to be worse of all their shortcomings, declaring that children are morally much more perceptive than adults and quickly notice the hypocrisy of parents, which leads to losing respect for them and interests in all processes of their education. Parents frequently tend to discard the shortcomings that they do not observe and recognize, or they often justify themselves in the process of upbringing the children. Tolstoy knew the fact to be one of the foremost useful circumstances for education; adults need to make their lives so that it is not scary to show it to their children. "Education of others is included in the upbringing of oneself, and you do not need anything else" (Tolstoy 1911; Wolff 2017). "To be truthful and honest with children, without hiding from them what is happening in the soul, is the only way of upbringing" (Tolstoy 1911; Robertson 2016).

Bekhterev (1909) had similar viewpoints with these scientists for the mentioned issues and, he addressed that a child takes everything on faith without criticism, which can be used, instilling in him all the good and nurturing disgust for everything wrong. The scientist addressed the significant factors of upbringing suggestion, followed by encouragement with the approval or disapproval of a child's actions, and also giving an example. It is noteworthy that all four teachers were opponents against punishment and making any pain to a child (Thompson 2016).

CONCLUSION

The authors concluded in the course of analysis that the concepts of family, and not only education of the scientists under study, are of particular interest in the present time considering the challenges confronting modern education and family. The comprehension of the heritage of pedagogical thought becomes especially urgent under present conditions, in which the personality of a child is recognized as the highest value, and the pedagogical process is permeated with excellent ideas and humanism. This is a type of humanistic orientation that has been observed to be the characteristic of the scientific heritage of the authors under study. Their pedagogical ideas engage with the truth that respecting children as persons, maintaining the natural or creating favorable conditions for their

harmonious development, understanding the individuality of each child, truthfulness in communication and the absence of hypocrisy in the actions of parents, presenting personal example for moral imitation, instilling a habit of work and promoting the disclosure of interest in knowledge – in one way or another, stand out as the fundamental elements of the suitable education of children from the age of the family period. In conclusion, the authors agree with Leo Tolstoy's words that the degree of society's perfection is conditioned by the way it cares about parents, family upbringing, and self-education of parents, that it is impossible to develop appropriately in public life without proper education. For which reason, the reference to the pedagogical views of outstanding scientists of Kazan University is justified and timely.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to obtain general results for future studies it is suggested that a comparative analysis of educational perspectives on family education of such prominent personalities mentioned in this study on prominent academic personalities of other universities in the country Russia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

- Babintsev VP, Sapryka V, Serkina YI, Ushamirskaya GF 2016. Reform of higher education in Russia: Habitus conflict. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 17(3): 284-294.
- Bekhterev VI 1909. Issues of education at the age of the first childhood. *Education: St. Petersburg*, 2: 24-60.
- Bekhterev VI 1927. On public education of young children. *Revolution and Culture*, 2: 39-41.
- Fedorov VA, Tretyakova NV 2016. The development of vocational pedagogical education in Russia (organizational and pedagogical aspect). *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(17): 9803-9818.
- Gabdulchakov VF 2017. Children's second language speech development in the context of family education. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 7(3): 612.
- Gromova C, Khairutdinova R, Birman D, Kalimullin A 2019. Teaching technologies for immigrant children: An exploratory study of elementary school teachers in Russia. *Intercultural Education*, 30(5): 1-15.
- Guseva LG 2018. Konstantin Dmitrievich Ushinsky: The founder of scientific pedagogy in the 19th century Russia. *History of Education & Children's Literature*, 13(1): 17-29.
- Inanç G, Liew JH 2017. Teaching the heritage of "others" and making it "ours": The power of cultural heritage education. In: MJK Walsh (Ed.): *The Armenian Church of Famagusta and the Complexity of Cypriot Heritage*. Cham, London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 285-299.
- Ionova OM, Kot YP 2013. The contribution of teachers of the second half of XIX-early XX century in the development of anthropological ideas. *Pedagogics, Psychology, Medical-biological Problems of Physical Training and Sports*, 17(11): 17-21.
- Kaptev PF 1982. *Selected Pedagogical Works*. Moscow: Pedagogy (In Russian).
- Kataeva VI, Kurova OV, Koludanova SV, Sulyagina JO, Fomicheva TV, Kryukova EM 2015. Barriers of inequality in social institutions of Russia. *Biosciences Biotechnology Research Asia*, 12(3): 2813-2820.
- Khovanskaya ES, Fakhutdinova AV, Maklakova NV 2017. University, as a social phenomenon. *Man in India*, 97(9): 101-107.
- Lesgaft PF 1951. *Family Education of a Child and its Meaning- Selected Pedagogical Works*. 2 Volumes. Moscow: Nauka Publisher.
- Luchinskaya EN, Karabulatova IS, Zelenskaya VV, Golubtsov SA 2018. Characteristics of image of the Russian family in modern advertising discourse. *Astra Salvensis*, 11: 21-37.
- Robertson G 2016. Alternative approaches to education: Tolstoy's thinking on teaching and learning and its relevance for today. *Research in Teacher Education*, 6(1): 12-17.
- Sheregi FE, Aref'ev AL 2016. Public? Consciousness of Russians in the socio-cultural and historical dimension: Problems of identity. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(16): 9614-9633.
- Thompson R 2018. Social and personality development in childhood. *General Psychology* FA18, 292.
- Tikhonova N 2017. *Poverty and Social Exclusion in the New Russia*. UK: Routledge.
- Tolstoy LN 1911. *Pedagogical Papers. From the journal "Yasnaya Polyana"*. Moscow. Kusneryev and Co. Publ.
- Troshin G Ya 1915. *Anthropological Basis of Education. Comparative Psychology of Normal and Abnormal Children*. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg Press.
- Ushinskiy KD 2004. *Man as an Object of Education*. Moscow: Fair-Press.
- Vainer ES, Fakhutdinova AV 2016. Some aspects of the development of the family legislation in the parent-child relationship in modern Russia. *International*

- Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 1(1): 412-417.
- Van Manen M 2016. *The Tact of Teaching: The Meaning of Pedagogical Thoughtfulness*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Vecco M, Srakar A 2018. The unbearable sustainability of cultural heritage: An attempt to create an index of cultural heritage sustainability in conflict and war regions. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 33: 293-302.
- Wolff S 2017. *Childhood and Human Nature: The Development of Personality*. UK: Routledge.
- Zakirova VG, Masalimova AR, Nikoghosyan, MA 2016. The contents, forms and methods of family upbringing studying based on the differentiated approach. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 11(1): 181-190.

Paper received for publication in October, 2019
Paper accepted for publication in December, 2019