Understanding Ukrainian pedagogical sciences through textbook analysis of four 'Pedagogy' textbooks

Olena Fim'yar
(Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, UK)

Iryna Kushnir
(Institute of Education, Nottingham Trent University, UK)

Mariia Vitrukh
*(PhD student, Mary Lou Fulton Teacher's College,
Arizona State University, USA)*

ABSTRACT

In comparison to a vast literature on Soviet education (including Muckle 1984; Popkewitz 1984) little is known about Ukrainian pedagogical sciences apart form a mounting critique about the issues of academic dishonesty and plagiarism, which relates to all HE disciplines, (Parkhomenko 2016, OECD 2017, Surzhyk 2016 and 2017), the absence of an empirical tradition in education research, a poor record of publication in peer-reviewed journals, and the dominance of a positivist approach, which seeks to discover 'laws' rather than reach 'understanding' (Grebennikova 2012, Fimyar and Schudlo 2015). This paper offers a thematic analysis of four 'Pedagogy' textbooks – three textbooks for under-graduate studies (Fitsula 2009, Volkova 2012 and Pashcheko and Krasnoshtan 2014) and one textbook for post-graduate study (Sysoyeva and Kryptopchuk 2013). The textbook analysis demonstrates that Ukrainian pedagogical sciences as a research tradition is deeply rooted in its own conceptual apparatus with no apparent relation to the current debates about teaching and learning in a wider Europe. The key proposition of the paper is that Ukrainian pedagogical sciences represent a mixture of Herbatianism and dialectical materialism, with more recent developments that emphasise 'acme' or 'perfectionism' that could be compared to debates on virtue ethics in education. Alongside these narratives the discourse of 'Kozak pedagogy' contributes to the nation-building narrative in education. The paper calls for a review of the content of 'Pedagogy' textbooks currently used in HEIs in Ukraine and envisages that the newly established Ukrainian Educational Research Association (UERA) can provide a platform for this important undertaking.

INTRODUCTION

There is a dearth of international studies on Ukrainian higher education (HE) with the exception of a few country reports (e.g. British Council 2015, International Renaissance Foundation 2015, OECD 2017, World Bank 2003) and a handful of publications in international peer-reviewed journals (Filiatreau 2011, Koshmanova and Ravchyna 2008, Kovtun and Stick 2009, Kushnir 2016, Oleksiyenko 2016, Shaw 2013). The topics addressed in these studies include the questions of education reform and policy (Kovtun and Stick 2009, Filiatreau 2011, Shaw 2013, Kushnir 2016), initial teacher education (Koshmanova and Ravchyna 2008) and the question

of academic integrity (Osipian 2009, 2010). These studies advance a proposition that attempts at reforming education in Ukraine are driven by a hybrid neo-liberal and post-communist rationality (Fimyar 2010), which explains a number of failed reforms (Kuzio 2012, Shaw 2013). Looking at the level of policy-making in secondary level education, Fimyar (2010) explains these drivers as 'simultaneous attempts to *recapture Ukraine's past* and to build a "spiritually and culturally rich" nation while at the same time *catch[ing] up with developed "Europe"* and thereby building a "modern and technologically advanced" market economy' (p. 85). Inevitably, the two distinct political projects envisaged by the successive ministers are prone to create tensions and incoherencies at the level of policy and practice. Tracing the implementation of the Bologna Process reforms, Kushnir (2016) observed similar tendencies, whereby change in policy rhetoric did not translate into changes in institutional practices.

Other alarming issues deeply embedded in Ukrainian HE are widespread practices of academic dishonesty and plagiarism (Osipian 2010, Parkhomenko 2016, OECD 2017, Surzhyk 2016, 2017) widely reported in international reports and national media. The latest OECD report, which looks at systemic integrity violation in education in Ukraine suggests that in HE 'plagiarism in some form is practised by 93% of students' (OECD 2017, p. 147), and 'on average, no less than 50% of dissertations do not meet minimum standards of academic quality, or are plagiarised, or both' (IED 2015 cited in OECD 2017, p. 147). While the adoption of the 2014 Higher Education Law and attendant policy documents (Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, 2018) is aimed at tackling the issue by delegating the responsibility for detecting plagiarism to the Attestation Board of the Ministry of Education and Science, the National Quality Assurance Agency for HE (NAQA), and the Academic Councils of Higher Education Institutions (OECD 2017, p. 145), the factors contributing to the prevalence of academic dishonesty and plagiarism remain. Among these are limitations in legislation, institutional capacity, lack of ethical norms, assessment procedures prone to dishonesty, lack of detection capacity and impunity for acts of academic dishonesty (OECD 2017, p. 149–52).

Persisting Soviet-era practices of separating HE teaching and research, exacerbated by decades of inadequate funding, also negatively impact the quality of education research in Ukraine. During the Soviet era, universities were not seen as centres of research, and research was a remit of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. This practice has continued in modern-day Ukraine. For example, in the field of education research, the task of conducting pedagogical research is designated to the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine (NAPSU) and its affiliated research institutes. The 2014 Higher Education Law attempted to modify some aspects of this practice by stipulating the ideas of 'academic freedom' and 'autonomy' (article 1, clause 1.3). However, the separation of research and teaching is retained in the practices of the NAPSU. For example, it is stipulated that the Academy can have an intake of master's student; however, it will only be responsible for the research part of the degree, while it will have to cooperate with higher education institutions (HEIs), which will provide the taught component of the degree (article 5, clause 5).

Another important characteristic of Ukrainian pedagogical research is a long-standing tradition of distinguishing between 'fundamental' and 'applied' research – a distinction that will be explored in greater detail in this paper. The NAPSU website is currently listing 51 fundamental research projects (NAPSU 2019b) and 46 applied research projects (NAPSU 2019a) undertaken by different institutes of NAPSU between 2017 and 2020. The examples of 'fundamental' research projects include:

- 'Trends in the development of school education in the EU, the USA and China'
  (Project No 1; Institute of Pedagogy; 2018-2020);
- 'Discursive techniques of identity formation [Ukr. *self-construction of personality*]'
  (Project No. 12; G.S. Kostiuk Institute of Psychology; 2017-2019);
- 'Trends in the development of adult education in developed countries'
  (Project No. 21; Institute of Pedagogy and Adult Education; 2017-2019);
- 'Teaching technologies for adult learners in formal and non-formal education'
  (Project No 23; Institute of Pedagogy and Adult Education; 2017-2019);
- 'Strategies and methods of creative personality development' (Project No 49;
  Institute of Gifted Child; 2018-2020). (NAPSU 2019b)

The examples of 'applied' research projects include:

- 'Didactic-methodological support of competency-oriented teaching in primary
  school' (Project No 1; Institute of Pedagogy; 2017-2019);
- 'Methodology of competency-oriented teaching of the Ukrainian Language to lyceum
  students according to the level of the [educational] standard' (Project No 5; Institute
  of Pedagogy; 2018-2020);
- 'Organisational and pedagogical principles of designing education environment in a
  gymnasium' (Project No 14; Institute of Pedagogy; 2019-2021);
- 'Psychological factors of deviant behaviour of minors in the conditions of social
  transformations' (Project No 18; G.S. Kostiuk Institute of Psychology; 2019-2021);
- 'Modernisation of organisation of educational process in the establishments of
  extracurricular education (Project No 25; Institute of Problems of Upbringing; 2018-
  2020)'. (NAPSU 2019a)

The above examples of research projects share several important characteristics. They all have a tendency to a high level of generalisation and unspecified methodological approaches. They tend to focus on 'principles' or 'trends', which are reflective of dialectical materialism as a 'form of logic which considers the world as absolute and relative, as having definable patterns and determinacy' (Popkewitz and Tabachnik 1981, p. 9). The main criticism of dialogical materialism often mentioned in the literature is its attempt to equate the social world with the natural world.

Back in 1971 Rosen raised a critique of methodological weaknesses of 'largely descriptive work of Soviet research' which contains 'little more than demonstration or pilot studies' and 'scant accumulation of experimental data' (Rosen 1971, p. 56 cited in Popkewitz and Tabachnik 1981, p. 15). However, Popkewitz and Tabachnick (1981) described Rosen's critique as an attempt to reduce all science to the canons of the positivism of American social science. For them, the 'Soviet experimental approach is similar to the classic experiment in science, such as those done by Galileo. The purpose of such experimentation is to study the qualitative effects or relationships suggested by some novel theoretical analysis' (Popkewitz and Tabachnik 1981, p. 16). In the same contribution, they explain that 'the favoured methodological approach in Soviet educational research appears to the "natural" or "formative" experiment [which] relies principally on observation and participation in regular classroom settings [whereby] precise controls are not imposed before or during the experiment' (Popkewitz and Tabachnik 1981, p. 32).

As an attempt to introduce new approaches and methodologies to education, the Ukrainian Educational Research Association (UERA) was established in 2015. The UERA's founders envisaged that the organisation would be built on the values of democratic governance, ethical research, peer-reviewing, evidence-based pedagogy, collaboration, capacity-building and inter-disciplinarity (UERA 2016). The UERA's website currently features bustling activity for its members, promoting education research and capacity-building opportunities, many of which are supported by EU funding, including the Jean Monnet and Erasmus+ Programmes. One of the most significant undertakings by the UERA current leadership is the 'Ukrainian Teachers and Teaching Climate' report based on the representative national survey, which uses Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) methodology (UERA 2018).

The link between the state of development of discipline and textbooks, which teach the discipline, is pointedly explained in Nisbet's discussion about early textbooks in education research (2002). Nisbet argues for a better acknowledgement of the role of textbooks in 'the creation of a new discipline, in marking its boundaries and shaping its content, and also in legitimating new extensions' in subsequent development of discipline (Nisbet 2002, p. 38). He further explains, that

> When an academic discipline is well established, the influence of the textbook is mainly through recognised courses of instruction for students: the book defines the topics which come within the scope of the discipline and indicates appropriate procedures for investigation. It consolidates and confirms existing perceptions, whereas at an early stage in the emergence of a new discipline, the textbook has a more formative role, acting as a guide to researchers venturing into these unexplored areas and so shaping the boundaries and content of the new discipline. At a later stage, a new textbook may give a new direction to the discipline. (Nisbet 2002, p. 38).

This paper uses thematic analysis of four 'Pedagogy' textbooks (Fitsula 2009, Paschenko and Krasnoshtan 2014, Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk 2013, Volkova 2012)[1] to understand the state of the art of Ukrainian pedagogy and its relation to other education traditions in Europe. The key proposition of the paper is that Ukrainian pedagogical sciences represent a mixture of Herbartianism and dialectical materialism, with more recent developments that emphasise 'acme' or 'perfectionism' that could be compared to debates on virtue ethics in education. Alongside these narratives, the discourse of 'Kozak pedagogy' is also prominent. The paper concludes with a call for a review of the content of 'Pedagogy' textbooks currently used in HEIs in Ukraine, and envisages that the newly established UERA will provide a platform for this important undertaking.

PRACTICE, SCIENCE, ART AND CRAFT OF PEDAGOGY

---

[1] Fitsula, M. (2009). *Pedagogy: Textbook. 3rd Edition.* Academic press: Kyiv.
Paschenko, M. and Krasnoshtan I. (2014). *Pedagogy: Textbook.* Academic literature centre: Kyiv.
Sysoyeva, S. and Krystopchuk, T. (2013). *Methodology of Scientific-pedagogical Research: Textbook*. Vydavnytstvo Oberehy: Rivne. Available at
http://elibrary.kubg.edu.ua/9021/1/Metodologiya_naukovo-pedagogichnikh_doslidzhen.pdf (accessed February 16, 2018).
Volkova, M. (2012). *Pedagogy: Textbook. 4rd Edition.* Academic press: Kyiv.

'Pedagogy' is a contested term, unevenly received in pedagogical discourses in the English-speaking world and continental Europe (see Alexander 2008, Best 1998, Watkins and Mortimore 1999). While in continental Europe pedagogy is regarded as a well-established academic discipline, in the English-speaking world, pedagogy, which has received attendant criticisms about being a poorly defined and ill-conceived term, became historically neglected (Watkins and Mortimore 1999, Simon 1981). Instead, in Britain and the US, discourses of curriculum have become more prominent, which is reflective of the history of devolved responsibilities for curriculum construction in that part of the world (Alexander 2008). As a result, in Britain and the US, pedagogy was made 'subsidiary to curriculum' (Alexander 2008, p. 47).

The term 'pedagogy' has a long history. It stems from a Greek word meaning 'attendant leading a boy to school' (Watkins and Mortimore 1999, p. 1). In other accounts, 'pedagogue' is translated as a 'slave who ushers the children forward until they are ready for their private tutor' (Best 1988, p. 157). 'Pedagogy' entered the Oxford English Dictionary in 1571. In modern day usage it stands for: (1) 'A place of instruction; a school, a college; a university'; (2) 'Instruction, discipline, training; a system of introductory training; a means of guidance'; (3) 'The art, occupation, or practice of teaching. Also: the theory or principles of education; a method of teaching based on such a theory' (Oxford English Dictionary, 2018).

The primary concern of this paper is the meaning of pedagogy as academic discipline. In mainland Europe, pedagogy as academic discipline has a very broad meaning. It encompasses discourses of 'health and bodily fitness, social and moral welfare, ethics and aesthetics, as well as […] the institutional forms that serve to facilitate societies and individual's pedagogical aims' (Marton and Booth 1997, p.178 cited in Watkins and Mortimore 1999, p. 2). To further illustrate this point, Alexander (2008) uses an example of curriculum structure of a pedagogy degree at a Russian pedagogical university, which includes courses on 'general culture' (e.g. philosophy, ethics, history, economics, literature, art and politics); as well as foundations of psychology, physiology, child development, child law, and preparation for subject teaching, or *didaktika* and *metodika*, which links all the elements of teaching together (p. 46).

In its current usage in Ukraine, pedagogy as academic discipline is referred to as 'pedagogical sciences', as, for example, in the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, while initial teacher educators receive their degrees in the 'pedagogy and methodology of teaching' of a particular subject. This tendency of pedagogy as academic discipline to unite under its banner a wide array of theories and discourses makes it open to criticisms, one of which is, arguably, the lack of rigour in its conceptual apparatus and methodological approaches.

The major disagreement among educators and researchers who attempted to provide a definition of pedagogy is whether pedagogy represents 'science' or 'art'. For some, there were enough grounds to argue that pedagogy cannot be further removed from being a 'science', as it is 'nothing more that intuition, affect, a compilation of interpersonal relations' (Best 1988, p. 161). Historically, pedagogy is associated with the 'science of teaching', which stems from the works of Pestalozzi and Kant. However, it is Johann Friedrich Herbart who is considered the founder of the tradition of 'pedagogy as science'. Herbart practised his work in Germany, but become influential in the US due to the translation of his seminal book *Allgemaine Pädagogik* (1806), meaning 'General Pedagogics', which, according to Hamilton (1999), was inadequately translated as the 'Science of Education'.

Herbart viewed the ultimate goal of his philosophy as finding 'the foundation of true psychological knowledge' (Herbart 1896, p. 21). The link between pedagogy and psychology is important here. It is discussed in more detail in Best's contribution, where the case of France is used to illustrate metamorphoses of the term 'pedagogy' (Best 1988, p. 158–9). In the 1950s and 1960s, France witnessed the birth of a new science – 'psycho-pedagogy' – which was subsequently replaced by 'pedagogical sciences' in the early 1970s. This was considered to be a better alternative for an ill-conceived, newly coined 'psycho-pedagogy', which, according to the many criticisms coming from the circles of French philosophers at the time, rested on a shaky foundation and could not provide 'adequate explanation of educational phenomena' (Best 1988, p. 159). In Ukraine now, and in the Soviet Union previously, the legacy of the merger of the terms is still evident in the widely used term 'psychological-pedagogical' (as in 'psychological-pedagogical approaches', 'psychological-pedagogical characteristics', etc.), which preface all things related to education and continue to operate in pedagogical discourses in Ukraine without facing any significant challenges or objections from the educational community.

An important contribution, which cemented the Herbartian view of pedagogy as 'science', was Herbart's approach to instruction, which he advocated should unfold in a series of stages:

> The first Herbartian stage (clearness) entailed the analysis of previous notions and the addition of new matter; the second stage (association) focused on the collation, comparing and contrasting similar phenomena; the third stage (system) was directed towards the establishment of generalised notions; and, at the final stage (method), practical applications were drawn from the results of the earlier stages (Hamilton 1999, p.144).

Apart from his contribution to theory of instruction, Herbart put forward a number of other concepts that were considered groundbreaking at the time. For example, in an attempt to move beyond a dual view of the teacher's task as one of either 'instruction' or 'education', Herbart put forward the notion of *erziehenden Unterrichts* – educating instruction (Biesta and Miedema 2002, p. 173). Other concepts, which were part of Herbart's theory, and which were later revived by his followers,[2] are those of 'interest', 'moral training' and didactics (Hamilton 1999, p. 144).

However, it is Herbart's epistemological position, which was premised on 'metaphysics and mathematics, besides self-observation, experience and experiments' (Herbart 1896, p. 21), that contributed to the subsequent demise of his theories. De Garmo (1896) further illustrates Herbart's belief in metaphysics as a basis for psychology and Herbart's assumption around moral judgements and ethics, which contributed to his view of pedagogy as 'science'. Herbart's ideas were met with criticism in scholarly circles, especially with the appearance of new pedagogical theories, such as those of John Dewey (Hayward and Thomas 1903). Despite the criticism, Herbart's ideas were revived later, but with a much lower momentum than they had had before (Hamilton 1999) and, as this paper will demonstrate, they continue to shape pedagogical thinking in Ukraine.

---

[2] See Hamilton's (1999, p. 144) discussion about the revival of Herbart's instructional theory in the works by Volkmar Stoy (1815–85), Friedrich Wilhelm Dörpfeld (1824–93) and Twiskon Ziller (1817–82).

To address the shortcomings of the overemphasis on 'science' in earlier iterations of the term 'pedagogy', the term 'pedagogics', which stands for 'science, art and principles of pedagogy', was introduced in academic and practitioner discourse in the late 18th century. While in linguistic terms, 'pedagogy' is used almost on a par with 'pedagogics' (Oxford English Dictionary 2018), in academic circles 'pedagogy' is a more accepted term. Best (1988) traces another metamorphosis of the term 'pedagogy', when the term 'didactics' was first coined in Germany and soon afterwards adopted in France in part as the attempt to address continuing criticisms of pedagogy as an academic discipline. According to Best, 'didactics' was coined to denote 'our understanding of the relationship between the content that is taught, those who are taught and the teacher' (Best 1988, p. 161). As a result of this split between pedagogy and didactics, 'general pedagogy' has become the philosophy, the sociology and the social psychology of education, whereas 'specialised' or 'subject' pedagogy has become didactics (Best 1988, p. 161).

According to Hamilton (1999), the European discourse of didactics is similar to the Anglo-American discourse of pedagogy. He explains that 'in both of its classical and Enlightenment senses, pedagogy denoted the process of upbringing and the influences that might shape this human activity' (Hamilton 1999, p. 136). He further explains that since the 16th and 17th centuries, the terms *pedagogy* and *didactics* have been circulating in conjunction. He illustrates this by referring to the Oxford English Dictionary issued in the 1970s where one of the definitions of pedagogy is the 'art or science of teaching', and one of the definitions of didactics is the 'science or art of teaching' (Hamilton 1999, p. 137). This similarity between the concepts was mirrored in their definitions provided a decade later. Simon (1981) defines pedagogy as the 'science of teaching embodying both curriculum and methodology' (p. 125), and Gundem (1998) defines didactics as 'a science and theory about teaching and learning in all circumstances and in all forms' (p. 6).

Drawing on McDonald (1992) and Marland (1993), Watkins and Mortimore (1999) move the debate around the definition of pedagogy forward by proposing an alternative way of thinking about pedagogy, which is as neither science nor art, but as a 'craft'. It is in this sense that Eisner views teaching as improvisatory for 'the ends it [teaching] achieves are often created in process' with a multiplicity of everchanging and unpredictable circumstances in which teaching takes place (Eisner 1979, p. 153 cited in Alexander 2008, p, 51). Similarly, Brown and McIntyre view experienced teachers' work as grounded in 'a *craft* knowledge of ideas, routines and conditions, which they map empirically in respect of pupils, time, content, the material environment and teachers themselves' (Brown and McIntyre, 1993 cited in Alexander 2008, p. 50).

The most recent contribution to the discussion of pedagogy, which revived the interest in this term in English-speaking countries and beyond, is the work by Alexander, who views pedagogy as both the act and discourse (Alexander 2000, p. 540). He defines pedagogy as 'the act of teaching and body of knowledge, argument and evidence in which it is embedded and by which particular classroom practices are justified' (Alexander 2008, p. 46). By attending to both meanings of the term pedagogy, Alexander brings out attention to 'the bigger picture', whereby pedagogy 'connects the apparently self-contained act of teaching with culture and mechanisms of social control' (Alexander 2000, p. 540).

In the analysis that follows, we will demonstrate that the discussion about the definition of the term 'pedagogy' is largely absent in the four textbooks under analysis. What analysis demonstrates is the continuing legacy of Herbartian views of pedagogy, reinforced with dialectical materialism, alongside discourses of 'Kozak pedagogy', which are mobilised as nation-building narrative in education.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

This paper offers a thematic analysis of four 'Pedagogy' textbooks – three textbooks for undergraduate studies (Fitsula 2009; Volkova 2012; Pashcheko and Krasnoshtan 2014) and one textbook for postgraduate study (Sysoyeva and Kryptopchuk 2013). Our decision to use textbook analysis was guided by Nisbet's (2002) proposition that 'the textbook may be both a reflection of current development [in disciplines], and one of the influences on subsequent development' (Nisbet 2002, p. 38). Musteata (2011) viewed textbook analysis as 'an integral part of the reform and development of educational systems' (Musteata 2011, p. 3). O'Keeffe's (2013) approach to textbook analysis is based on four key elements: content, structure, expectation and language. The National Science Resources Centre assessment criteria (Swanepoel 2010, p. 135) included pedagogical appropriateness, content, and presentation and format. Open and axial coding (Blaikie 2010) were used to extract categories of the texts we analysed and establish relationships among them.

The decision to use textbooks for analysis was also influenced by existing studies, which used textbook analysis to explore the construction of national identities and political landscapes in post-Soviet contexts (e.g. Silova 2006, Silova, Mead and Palandjian, 2014, Williams 2014). Silova et al. (2014) focus on the role of 'spatial socialization' of their young readers in Armenia, Latvia and Ukraine (p. 103). Building on Newman and Paasi's (1998) theoretical framework, Silova et al. (2014) consider educational texts as embodying (and embedded in) plural 'pedagogies' of space as expressions of the national 'sociospatial consciousness' (Silova et.al. 2014).

We have selected the three textbooks for undergraduate studies based on the recommendation by a group of initial teacher educators currently working in two HEIs in Ukraine, who attended capacity-building training in the UK. They described these textbooks as 'classic' textbooks in initial teacher education, which are approved and recommended by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine[3], and are used as key resources in preparation for state examinations. We searched for an additional textbook for postgraduate studies online, in the hope of seeing an alternative approach to content and presentation of key pedagogical ideas in Ukraine. In each textbook we have analysed several chapters, which explain the structure and objectives of pedagogy as science and methodology, and methods of pedagogical research. The analysis starts by unpacking definitions of pedagogy, its sub-fields and links with other disciplines. The objectives of Ukrainian pedagogical science are analysed next, followed by an analysis of the typology of pedagogical research (fundamental, applied and implementation), and key methodological approaches and methods.

---

[3] The process of approval of the textbooks with the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine stamps is stipulated in the Order No 537 from 17.06.2018 (Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, 2008).

DATA DISPLAY: 'THE STATE OF THE ART' OF UKRAINIAN PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES

Little is known about the developments of Ukrainian pedagogical sciences after the collapse of the Soviet Union. This paper addresses this question through a textbook analysis of key pedagogy textbooks currently used as principal resources in undergraduate and postgraduate teaching degrees in initial teacher education in Ukraine. The textbooks were written by experienced Ukrainian scholars, who obtained their Candidate of Sciences degree in 1968 (Volkova and Sysoyeva) and 1986 (Kryptopchuk). The textbooks were selected for publication as a result of a national competition, and were approved by the Ministry of Education and Science and recommended as teaching resources in initial teacher education. The textbooks are key resources in preparation for state examinations.

Looking at the synopses[4] of the four textbooks (see Vignette 1), a few similarities between the textbooks can be observed. First, the introductory chapters offer information about the general principles and theories of pedagogy and tendencies of student personality development. Second, synopses place a lot of importance on developing teaching skills and attitudes, and skills of 'self-assessment' and 'self-analysis' (Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan 2014*)*. What is also evident is the breadth with which the discussion is presented – 'from the times of Kievan Rus to the present' (Fitsula 2009*)* or 'the formation of world and domestic pedagogical sciences and practice from the ancient times to the present' (Volkova 2012). The emphasis is placed on learning about the process of education reform, school education and 'innovative national education'. Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk's (2014) textbook is different in its focus, as it aims to provide methodological preparation for master's-level students to undertake pedagogical research.

Furthermore, all the textbooks place emphasis on upbringing as the main process and result of pedagogy, and convey a close link between pedagogy and psychology. All the textbooks also emphasise the existence of one theory of upbringing, and take a position that pedagogical processes follow objective rules or laws. Nevertheless, it remains unclear from these synopses what is the exact focus of pedagogy as an academic discipline. More importantly, the types of evidence or literature used to substantiate the claims in the textbooks are not mentioned in synopses. Direct citations of the synopses used in the textbooks are presented in Vignette 1.

---

[4] Synopses are cited from the textbooks. English-language translation from Ukrainian are done by the authors. The translation follows as closely as possible the style and grammatical structure of the original.

What stands in sharp contrast to the use of terms such as 'innovative' and 'the present' in the synopses in Vignette 1 are the outdated references, some of which are more than 50 years old (e.g. year of publication, 1966). The initial look at the list of references in Fitsula's (2009) textbook shows that despite the recent year of publication, the textbook mainly references the Soviet/Russian pedagogical tradition. With the abundance of studies from Soviet-era education cited in Fitsula (2009), one can see that educational discourses presented in the textbook do not advance beyond the time of the late Soviet period. Looking at Vignette 2, which presents the reference list from Fitsula's (2009) Chapter 1, one can conclude that the 21st-century pedagogical discourse has not yet arrived on the pages of this textbook, and that Ukrainian HE students continue to be educated predominantly through the conceptual apparatuses and discourses of the Soviet pedagogical tradition. Book titles such as *New School* (year of

publication, 1996) and *Pedagogical Forecast* (year of publication, 1987) look outdated and out of place for 21st-century educators in Ukraine.

Vignette 2: References from Fitsula's Chapter 1 (2009)

Volkov, G. (1966). *Ehtno-pedagogy of Chuvash People*. Cheboksary.
State National 'Education' Programme: Ukraine in the 21st century (1994). Kyiv.
Zhuravlev, V. (1990). *Pedagogy in the System of Human Sciences*. Moscow.
Zagviazinskiy, V. (1987). *Pedagogical Forecast.* Moscow.
Kravets, V. (1996). *Foreign Schooling and Pedagogy of the 20th Century.* Ternopil.
Kuz, V., Rudenko, Y., Serveychuk, Z. (1993). *Foundations of the National Upbringing.* Uman.
Podlasyy, I. (1999). *Pedagogy.* Moscow.
Rusova, S. (1996). *New School: Selected essays on pedagogy.* Kyiv.
Stelmakhovych, M. (1985). *People's Pedagogy.* Kyiv.
Slastenin, V., Isayev, I., Mishchenko, A., Shyyanov, E. (1998). *Pedagogy.* Moscow.
Franko, I. (1986). *The Latest Developments in Ethnography* [narodoznavstvo]. The 50-volume edition. Volume 45. Kyiv.

Pedagogy as 'science'

This part of the paper examines the aims and objectives of pedagogy as an academic discipline. It provides an analysis of the definitions of pedagogy, its content and its links with other disciplines.

Definition of pedagogy

Table 1 provides definitions of pedagogy presented in the four textbooks. All the definitions view pedagogy as a science that aims to uncover 'objective laws' pertinent to the development of personality.

Table 1: Definition of pedagogy

Fitsula (2009)	Volkova (2012)	Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013)	Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014)
'Pedagogy is a complex of theoretical and applied sciences that study processes of upbringing, teaching/learning, and development of personality' (p. 9). Pedagogy studies 'upbringing activities which take place in education establishments by professionals trusted by the society [teachers]' (p. 10).	Pedagogy is 'a self-contained/integral multidisciplinary science, which studies the laws [sic] of learning and upbringing, and the development of a child's personality' (p. 11). 'Pedagogy (Greek paidos – child, and ago – leading) is a science that studies the processes of upbringing, teaching and	Not provided	'Pedagogy is a science about upbringing a person. By upbringing we mean education, teaching/learning and personality development' (p. 13).

	learning, and the development of personality' (p. 12).		

In the definitions in Table 1, Fitsula (2009) and Volkova (2012) emphasise that pedagogy is a science, which is limited mainly to formal education (Fitsula 2009). Adult education is not acknowledged as part of pedagogy, to the extent that some sources imply that there is a separation between adult education and pedagogy. For example, Volkova (2012) states that 'Pedagogical science emerged as a theory of upbringing for the young generation' (p. 13) and continues to discuss the importance of this age for the development of personality.

A few observations need to be included about the level of complexity of language that the authors of the textbooks use to convey their ideas. The authors tend to use complex language, which can pose difficulties for students' comprehension. For example, Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013) tend to use a number of English transliterations conjugated according to rules of Ukrainian grammar, including 'targeted procedural actions' (Ukr. 'цілеспрямованих *процесуальних [process]* дій') (p. 11); 'have to admit the most important immanent reason' (Ukr. 'доводиться констатувати найважливішу *іманентну [immanent]* причину') (p. 11); 'the problems of education modernisation are resolved voluntarily' (Ukr. 'проблеми модернізації освіти розв'язуються *волюнтаристськи [voluntarily]*') (p. 21).

Another tendency present in all the textbooks are the carefully drawn distinctions between the 'subject' and 'object' of this discipline. Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014) maintain that: 'The object of science [is] something that exists as a reality beyond the actual investigation. The same object can be studied by different disciplines' (p. 18). Volkova defines the object of pedagogical science as the 'area of social activities, the main purpose of which is upbringing and teaching' (p. 12). The author defines the subject of pedagogy as 'relationships that develop in the process of pedagogical activities, methods, principles, on the basis of which these activities are performed, laws and tendencies by which these activities are guided as an integral process' (p. 13). Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014) provide a similar definition of the subject of pedagogy, which is 'the actual process of development and formation of personality in the context of upbringing, teaching/learning, [and] education' (p. 19).

Sub-fields of pedagogy: When everything is becoming pedagogy

Table 2 provides an overview of the branches of pedagogy presented in the textbooks under analysis.

Table 2: Branches of pedagogy

Fitsula (2009)	Volkova (2012)	Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013)	Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014)
- General pedagogy	- General pedagogy (foundations of pedagogy, theory of teaching and education (didactics), theory of upbringing, theory of	-Methodology of education	- Pedagogies of different famous people (e.g.,

- Age-specific pedagogy - Pedagogy for correction [special needs pedagogy] (surdo-pedagogy (for the deaf-mute), speech therapy, pedagogy for the blind, pedagogy for oligophrenia) - Branch pedagogies [Ukr. *haluzevi pedagogiky*] (avia pedagogy, army pedagogy) - History of pedagogy and school - Methodologies of teaching specific subjects [Ukr. *predmetni metodyky*] - Social pedagogy (p. 18).	managing the teaching-upbringing process (school studies)) - Age-specific pedagogy (pre-school pedagogy, pedagogy of secondary education) - Professional pedagogy (pedagogy of vocational education, pedagogy of HE) - Pedagogy for correction [special needs pedagogy] (surdo-pedagogy (for the deaf-mute), speech therapy, pedagogy for the blind, pedagogy for oligophrenia) - History of pedagogy - Methodologies of teaching specific subjects - School hygiene - Comparative pedagogy - Branch pedagogies (avia pedagogy, army pedagogy) - Folk pedagogy - Pedagogy of ethnography [Ukr. *narodoznavstva*] - Family pedagogy - Kozak pedagogy - Spiritual pedagogy - Pedagogical deontology (about the code of conduct for teachers) - Social pedagogy (pp. 12–18).	- History of education - Pedagogy in different subject areas - Special needs pedagogy (p. 15).	pedagogy of Disterveg (p. 16) - 'Kozak pedagogy is the highest peak of Ukrainian national pedagogy' (p. 17).

What is striking in Table 2 is the all-encompassing nature of pedagogy, which stretches across time and different fields of human activity. Pedagogy embraces the ideas of prominent educational thinkers and certain historical periods, which are significant in modern Ukraine (e.g. Kozak pedagogy). Table 2 gives an impression that all aspects of human activity can potentially come under the banner of pedagogy, and that everything is becoming a pedagogy.

Links with other disciplines

All the textbooks except for Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013) discuss the interdisciplinary nature of pedagogy. Fitsula (2009) maintains that pedagogy has links with philosophy, sociology, psychology, and people's anatomy and physiology. Volkova (2012) provides the same list, supplementing it with economics and ethnology. Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014) discuss the links between Ukrainian pedagogy and foreign pedagogies. Fitsula (2009) expresses similar views about a distinct nature of the Ukrainian pedagogy. Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014) go even further by stating that the personalities of Ukrainian students develop differently from the personalities of foreign students.

In an attempt to situate Ukrainian pedagogy in relation to foreign pedagogy, Fitsula (2009, pp. 20-23) list the following most important directions of foreign pedagogy: philosophical, psychological-pedagogical and social. He maintains that the philosophical direction emerged from the philosophy of neo-positivism, existentialism, neo-Thomism, and others. The psychological-pedagogical direction was developed in the theories of German theorists such as Wilhelm Leah (1862–1926) and Ernst Meyman (1862–1916) in the early 20th century. The social direction is concerned with the substantiation of the doctrine of a so-called 'noosphere' (the interaction between nature and society), and the development of 'the noosphere pedagogy' in the early 20th century.

Questions of methodology and sampling in Ukrainian pedagogical sciences

Having discussed the meaning of pedagogy and its sub-fields, and its links with other disciplines, we now turn to the analysis of methodological approaches outlined in the textbooks under analysis.

Types of pedagogical research

The analysis of the types of pedagogical research suggests that the quest for objective truth is the main preoccupation of Ukrainian pedagogical sciences. There is also a widely accepted typology of pedagogical research, which distinguishes between 'fundamental', 'applied' and 'implementation' research. According to Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013), the classification of pedagogical sciences into fundamental, applied and implementation is the most common in policy documents and in social science research (p. 16). This same classification is presented in other textbooks under analysis (e.g., Fitsula 2009, Volkova 2012, Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan 2014). Table 3 outlines key differences between the three types of research using examples from Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013).

Table 3: 'Fundamental', 'applied' and 'implementation': Confusion between methodology and sampling

	Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013, p. 16)

Fundamental [studies]	- Create basis for applied and implementation research - Aim to develop theories and theoretical concepts through uncovering general tendencies in the pedagogical process - Work out methodology for pedagogical research - Use big research samples - Add to the history of pedagogy
Applied [studies]	- Are based on fundamental research - Have narrower focus than fundamental research - Aim to address current practical situations and develop recommendations of how to improve the pedagogical process - Use methods worked out by fundamental research - Use smaller research samples - Take short time to conduct research and use its results - Do *not* uncover general tendencies in the pedagogical process
Implementation [studies]	- Are based on applied research - Aim to help implement the results of applied research in practice (explanations of the conditions suitable for the creation of new education establishments, study programmes, textbooks, etc.) - Have to be suitable for practical implementation

In trying to illustrate the differences between fundamental and applied research, Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013) use a metaphor of tree roots and branches, whereby applied research, similarly to tree branches, develops on the basis of fundamental research – tree roots, which feed branches (p. 20). The fact that the authors revert to the use of metaphors is further evidence of the rather eclectic nature of Ukrainian pedagogical sciences.

Methods of pedagogical research

According to Fitsula (2009), 'Method of scientific-pedagogical research [is] a way of researching the formation of personality, identification of the objective law/tendency in upbringing and teaching/learning by complex psychological-pedagogical methods' (p. 27). Volkova (2012) maintains that: 'Method of scientific-pedagogical research [is] a means of researching psychological-pedagogical processes of personality formation'. Table 4 provides an overview the methods of pedagogical research presented in the four textbooks under analysis. It is worth noting that Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk's (2013) textbook provides the most detailed account of methods. However, despite this abundance of classifications no examples or references to completed research are provided in all textbooks under analysis. As a result, students learn about research not by reading about or designing the studies, but by memorising the classifications shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Methods of pedagogical research

Fitsula (2009)	Volkova (2012)	Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013)	Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014)

Empirical: observation, discussion (interview), survey, experiment, studying school documents and students' work, ranking, summarising independent characteristics, psychological-pedagogical testing, sociometry, analysis of students' academic performance results. **Theoretical:** (analysis, synthesis, induction, deduction, comparison, classification, summarising, abstracting, specification). **Mathematical and statistical** (registering, ranking, modelling, measuring) (p. 27).	**Methods:** pedagogical observation, discussion, interview, experiment, studying the results of activities, sociological methods (surveys, ranking, summary of independent characteristics), science methods (p. 21). **Stages of research** (p. 33–5): research problem identification, studying scientific facts, studying school practice, hypothesis formation, experimental work, comparison of the results with mass practice, summarising research results, writing up of research results.	**Theoretical methods:** analysis and synthesis; induction and deduction; analogy and abstraction; concretisation and modelling; idealisation and formalisation; summary and comparison; thinking experiment. **Empirical methods:** pedagogical observation; pedagogical experiment; rating; testing; study, analysis and summary of pedagogical experience; scientific and pedagogical expedition; literature review. **Sociological methods:** questionnaires; interview and pedagogical talk; sociometrics/network analysis; expert analysis; pedagogical council (Ukr. *konsilium).* **Mathematical methods:** ranging; scales; synthesis; correlation; regression; cluster analysis; factor analysis; latent-structural analysis (pp. 85–323).	'The presence of scientific worldview allows a person to perceive the environment adequately and evaluate it objectively' (p. 20).

DISCUSSION: INTELLECTUAL ISOLATION OF UKRAINIAN PEDAGOGICAL 'SCIENCES'

The analysis presented in this paper points to a problem for the field of pedagogical sciences in Ukraine of intellectual isolation from the discussions taking place elsewhere in Europe, including theories of learning, teacher development, action research, marketisation of education, social inequalities, education for displaced populations, to name just a few. Attention has been drawn to the problem of intellectual isolation of Ukrainian pedagogical science by a number of scholars, including Fimyar and Schudlo (2015), and Shaw et al. (2012).

In the overview of the state of Ukrainian pedagogy after the Maidan Revolution, Fimyar and Schudlo (2015) noted the absence of an empirical tradition in education research, a poor record of publication in international peer-reviewed journals and the dominance of a positivist approach, which seeks to discover 'laws' rather than reach 'understanding', as key obstacles contributing to the stagnation of the discipline. To demonstrate the absence of an empirical tradition of pedagogical research, Fimyar and Schudlo (2015) critique an oft-cited definition of pedagogy as 'a science' that studies:

> the objective [sic] laws of the particular historical process of upbringing, organically [sic] connected with the laws of the development of social relations as well as the real [sic] social

upbringing practice of formation of young generations, [and] particulars and conditions of organisation of pedagogical process (Educational materials online, n.d. cited in Fimyar and Schudlo 2015).

Fimyar and Schudlo (2015) further maintain that the above definition shares several important characteristics with Grebennikova's (2012, pp. 6–7) study, which equates the latest developments in Ukrainian pedagogical research (including 'acmeology', 'educology' and 'human nanotechnology') with pseudosciences, which are characterised by:

- explicit or implicit anti-intellectualism manifested in the determination of their whole theory by a single holistic concept such as 'objective law', 'system', 'information', 'chaos' or 'game';
- optimism in the applicability of their core concepts to major spheres of human life;
- manipulative and mechanistic approach to social reality;
- opportunistic definitions of 'science' and 'method';
- substitution of methods by principles;
- theological nature manifested in the belief that an ideal that is implicit in their holistic doctrine can and should be achieved;
- hybridity of genres as a result of drawing on facts, methods and rhetoric used by different systems of cultural production, including religious and spiritual practice, sciences, media, art etc. (Grebennikova 2012, pp. 6–7 cited in Fimyar and Schudlo 2015; cf. Dmitriev 1997, p. 260).

Some roots of the stagnation of the discipline can be traced back to Soviet times. In an overview of Soviet pedagogical science, Popkewitz (1984) explained that 'for Soviet social and psychological scientists, [the] individual does not embrace reality through theoretical ability (contemplation), preconception or knowledge alone, but through a practical ability in which production and action takes precedence over knowledge' (Popkewitz 1984, p. 113). In relation to methodology and methods, Popkewitz commented that 'the Western tradition is concerned with the internal logic of knowledge, and efficiency and organisation of research procedures. While the Soviets are concerned with logic and efficiency, they place these concerns in an explicit normative, epistemological and conceptual context' (Popkewitz 1984, p. 116).

The discussion about the development of pedagogical sciences in Ukraine would not be complete without mentioning one important development in the late 1990s, when 'acmeology' as a part of the new science movement (NSM) was 'institutionalised as a science and a philosophy primarily among educational professionals in secondary and higher educational institutions in Ukraine' (Grebennikova 2012, p. 9). Following Gladkova and Pozharskyi (2011) Grebennikova (2012) explains that acmeology 'proposes to establish an integrative field of research to study regularities and conditions of "perfection" in different fields of human activity' (Gladkova and Pozharskyi 2011, p. 180 cited in Grebennikova 2012, p. 10). Drawing on Palchevs'kyi (2005), Grebennikova further explains that '[w]hat is meant under "perfection" is professionalism and professional success, which is a person's *acme*, the highest point of life. To reach one's *acme*, a professional should practice self-improvement and self-reliance; creativity and "finding your own genius" is a must' (Palchevs'kyi 2005, pp. 242–9 cited in Grebennikova 2012, p. 10).

Everything is believed to have an *acme*. A society reaches its highest perfection as an 'acmeo-socium' (UAAS 2009a) if it attains internal

equilibrium between groups, which is similar to economic optimum. At the same time, *acme* is relative. For example, general facts about a historical period retrospectively become its highest 'perfection' in acmeological reconstructions of history (Gladkova & Pozharskyi 2011, pp. 22–23), while the ability to fit into one's historical situation is considered the *acme* of an individual (Grebennikova 2012, pp. 10-11).

Although acmeology 'has not been officially recognised as a science: it still has no approval from the Ukrainian VAK (Higher Attestation Commission)' Grebennikova (2012, p. 10), its impact on the development of Ukrainian pedagogical sciences cannot be underestimated.

CONCLUSION

The analysis presented in this paper has demonstrated the eclectic nature of the Ukrainian pedagogical sciences, which represent a mixture of Herbatianism and dialectical materialism, with more recent developments that emphasise 'acme' or 'perfectionism' that could be compared to debates on virtue ethics in education. Alongside these narratives, the discourse of 'Kozak pedagogy [as] the highest peak of Ukrainian national pedagogy' contributes to the nation-building narrative in education (Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan 2014). The textbooks under analysis also project a view of education, as a teacher-led undertaking that primarily relies on rote learning and memorisation. The density of the language with which the material is presented poses difficulties to students' comprehension and stifles the debate about what teaching and learning in 21st-century Ukraine should look like and be modelled on.

We would like to conclude this paper by reflecting on the process of writing, which made us revisit our own experiences of secondary education and HE in Ukraine. This joint endeavour brought a lot of doubt and uncertainty about the value of this exercise. Our first concern was that this paper might become yet another publication that would be largely ignored in Ukraine. We were also aware that this paper, and the fact that all three of us received our postgraduate education outside Ukraine, can make it easy to interpret our argument as blind faith in Eurocentrism (see Fimyar's (2011) reflection on trying to escape this 'discourse').

What supported us in the process was the feeling of collegiality with future and present generations of students and teachers and Ukraine, and a shared sense of responsibility for the state and future directions of Ukrainian pedagogical sciences. What also gave us inspiration was the fact that the concerns raised in this paper are not the only voices in the field of education in Ukraine. Similar concerns are also raised in Ukraine by academic staff (see Parkhomenko 2016) and parents (see Andrusyak 2012, Zvynyackivska 2012a, 2012b), who eagerly critique the legacies of the past in research and school textbooks, and want to see a new version of education and research in Ukraine. To strengthen those voices, we call for an urgent review of the content of the pedagogy textbooks currently used in HEIs in Ukraine. Further research is needed to develop a roadmap for revision. UERA – in the establishment of which all three authors were actively involved – can provide a platform for this important undertaking.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES:

Alexander, R. J. (2000). *Culture and Pedagogy: International comparisons in primary education.* Oxford: Blackwell

Alexander, R. J. (2008). *Education for All: The quality imperative and the problem of pedagogy.* Brighton: Consortium for Research on Educational Access, Transitions and Equity.

Andrusyak, I. (2012). *Navischo mama rozlyvaye chay?* [In Ukr. Why does mom is 'pouring away' tea?] Ukrainska Pravda. Available at: https://life.pravda.com.ua/columns/2012/12/3/116848/ (accessed 15 February 2018).

Best, F. (1988). The metamorphoses of the term 'pedagogy'. *Prospects: Quarterly review of education,* Vol. XVIII, No 2, 157–66. Available at: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000080369 (accessed 12 May 2019).

Biesta, G. J. and Miedema, S. (2002). Instruction or pedagogy? The need for a transformative conception of education. *Teaching and Teacher education*, *18*(2), 173–181.

Blaikie, N. W. H. (2010). *Designing Social Research: The logic of anticipation*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press.

British Council (2015). Higher Education in Ukraine: Briefing Paper. Available at: https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/ukraine_he_briefing_paper.pdf (Accessed 14 May 2019).

De Garmo C. (1896). The significance of Herbart for secondary and higher education. *Educational Review*, *11*, 42–3.

Dmitriev, D. (1997). Pedagogical psychology and the development of education in Russia. In E.L. Grigorenko, P. Ruzgis, and R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Psychology in Russia: Past, Present, Future* (pp. 251-292). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Educational materials online (n.d.). *Ob'yek, Predmet, Funktsii i Zavdannia Pedagogiky* [in Ukr. Object, Subject, Functions and Tasks of Pedagogy]. Available at: http://pidruchniki.com/13121009/pedagogika/obyekt_predmet_funktsiyi_zavdannya_pedagogiki (accessed 13 May 2019).

Eisner, E. W. (1979). The use of qualitative forms of evaluation for improving educational practice. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *1*(6), 11–19.

Filiatreau, S. (2011). Ukraine's participation in the Bologna Process: Has it resulted in more transparency in Ukrainian higher education institutions? *International Research & Review: Journal of the Phi Beta Delta H*, *1*(1), 1–47.

Fimyar, O. (2010). Policy why(s): Policy rationalities and the changing logic of educational reform in postcommunist Ukraine. In I. Silova (ed.) *Post-Socialism is Not Dead: (Re)reading the global in*

comparative education (International Perspectives on Education and Society, Volume 14. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 61–91.

Fimyar, O. (2011). A manifesto of a post-communist post-structuralist researcher: Post-viva voce reflections. *European Education: Issues and Studies*, *43*(2), 74–97.

Fimyar O. and Shchudlo S. (2015). Pedagogy after Maidan: Can Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* offer a viable alternative for Ukraine? Presented at the *Danyliw Research Seminar on Contemporary Ukraine*. Available at: http://www.danyliwseminar.com/#!paper-fimyar/c6q1n (accessed 13 May 2019)

Grebennikova, G. (2012). *The Politics of Knowledge Innovation: The case of acmeology as a 'new science' movement in the Ukrainian educational system.* MPhil dissertation, University of Cambridge, UK. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/2633034/The_Politics_of_Knowledge_Innovation_the_Case_of_Acmeology_as_a_New_Science_Movement_in_the_Ukrainian_Educational_System (accessed 15 February 2018).

Gundem, B. B. (1998). *Understanding European Didactics—An Overview. Didactics (Didaktik, Didaktik (k), Didactique).* Oslo: University of Oslo. Institute for Educational Research.

Hamilton, D. (1999). The pedagogical paradox (or Why no didactics in England?). *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, *7*(1), 135–52.

Hayward, F. H. and Thomas, M. E. (1903). *The Critics of Herbartianism: And Other Matter Contributory to the Study of the Herbartian Question*. London: S. Sonnenschein.

Herbart, J. F. (1896). *The Science of Education, Its General Principles Deduced, from its Aim and the Aesthetic Revelation of the World*. (Classic Reprint). London: Forgotten Books.

International Renaissance Foundation (2015). Civil society monitoring study of IDP access to education. Available at http://www.irf.ua/knowledgebase/publications/?rubric=0&query=education (accessed 15 February 2018).

Koshmanova, T. and Ravchyna, T. (2008). Teacher preparation in a post-totalitarian society: An interpretation of Ukrainian teacher educators' stereotypes. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *21*(2), 137–58.

Kovtun, O. and Stick, S. (2009). Ukraine and the Bologna Process: A case study of the impact of the Bologna Process on Ukrainian state institutions. *Higher Education in Europe, 34*(1), 91–103.

Kushnir, I. (2016). The development of a system of study credits in Ukraine: The case of policy layering in the Bologna Process. *European Journal of Higher Education, 7*(2), 188–202.

Kuzio, T. (2012). Twenty years as an independent state: Ukraine's ten logical inconsistencies. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies, 45*(3–4), 429–38.

Law about Higher Education of Ukraine (2014). Available at: http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18 (accessed 15 February 2018).

Marland, P. W. (1993). A review of the literature on implications of teacher thinking research for preservice teacher education. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *21*(1), 51–63.

McDonald, J. P. (1992). *Teaching: Making sense of an uncertain craft*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Ministry of Education and Science in Ukraine (2008). Order No 537 of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine '*On the order of approval of textbooks, educational materials and teaching resources*

with the stamps and certificates of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine' from 17.06.2008. Available at: http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0628-08 (accessed 13 May 2019).

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (2018) Letter No 1/11-8681 from 15.08.2018 on 'Recommendations on Prevention and Detection of Academic Plagiarism in Research Work (essays, dissertation, monographs, presentations, publications, etc.)'. Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/rada/show/v8681729-18 (accessed 12 May 2019).

Muckle, J. (1988). *A Guide to The Soviet Curriculum: What the Russian child is taught in school.* London, New York, Sydney: Groom Helm.

Musteata, S. (2011). How to analyse textbooks: An essay on research approaches and possible consequences of research. Available at: http://www.diacronia.ro/ro/indexing/details/A6469/pdf (accessed 13 May 2019).

NAPSU (2019a). Thematic plan of applied research of the NAPSU for 2017. Available at http://naps.gov.ua/ua/activities/research/applications/ (accessed 4 July 2019).

NAPSU (2019b). Thematic plan of fundamental research of the NAPSU for 2017. Available at http://naps.gov.ua/ua/activities/research/fundamental/ (accessed 4 July 2019).

Newman, D. and Paasi, A. (1998). Fences and neighbours in the postmodern world: boundary narratives in political geography, *Progress in Human Geography*, 22 (2), 186-207.

Nisbet, J. (2002). Early textbooks in educational research: The birth of a discipline. *European Educational Research Journal, 1*(1), 37–44.

OECD (2017). Academic dishonesty – cheating and plagiarism in Ukrainian higher education in OECD. *OECD Reviews of Integrity in Education: Ukraine 2017:* 143–57.

O'Keeffe, L. (2013). *A Framework for Textbook Analysis.* Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275214893_A_Framework_for_Textbook_Analysis (accessed 13 May 2019).

Oleksiyenko, A. (2016). Higher Education Reforms and Center-Periphery Dilemmas: Ukrainian Universities Between Neo-Soviet and Neo-Liberal Contestations. In J. Zajda and V. Rust (eds) *Globalisation and Higher Education Reforms, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 15*. Switzerland: Springer, 133–48.

Osipian, A. (2009). Corruption and reform in higher education in Ukraine. *Canadian and International Education, 38*(2), 104–22.

Osipian, A. (2010). Corruption in the politicised university: Lessons for Ukraine's 2010 presidential elections. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, 23*(2), 101–14.

Oxford English Dictionary (2018). Available at http://www.oed.com/ (accessed 6 May 2019).

Parkhomenko, T. (2016). Yak komisiia ne pobachyla plahiat Kateryny Kyrylenko i svidomo pishla na falsyfikatsiyu [in Ukr. How the Committee did not see plagiarism in Kataryna Kyrylenko's [work] and consciously used falsification]. *Ukrainska Pravda*, Available at: http://life.pravda.com.ua/columns/2016/05/17/212396/ (accessed 15 February 2018).

Popkewitz, T. (1984). Soviet Pedagogical Science: Visions and contradictions. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 16*(2), 111–30.

Popkewitz, T. and Tabachnik, B (1981). Soviet and American pedagogical research. In B. Tabachnick, T. Popkewitz and B. Szekely (eds.) *Studying Teaching and Learning: Trends in Soviet and American Research*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Shaw, M. (2013). Flawed implementation or inconsistent logics? Lessons from higher education reform in Ukraine. *European Education, 45*(1), 7–24.

Shaw, M., Chapman, D. and Rumyantseva, N. (2012). The impact of the Bologna Process on academic staff in Ukraine. *Higher Education Management and Policy, 23*(3), 1–21.

Silova, I. (2006). De-Sovietisation of Latvian textbooks made visible. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies, 7*(2), 35–45.

Silova, I., Mead, M. and Palandjian, G. (2014). Pedagogies of space: (Re)Mapping national territories, borders, and identities in post-Soviet textbooks. In J. Williams (ed.) *(Re)constructing Memory: School textbooks and the imagination of the nation*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Simon, B. (1981). Why no pedagogy in England? In B. Simon and W. Taylor (eds) *Education in the Eighties: Central issues.* London: Batsford, 124–45.

Surzhyk, L. (2016). Psevdonauka na pototsi. [in Ukr. *Pseudoscience on a conveyor belt*]. *Zderkalo tyzhnia* 1078, 29 January – 5 February, 2016. Available at: https://dt.ua/SCIENCE/psevdonauka-na-potoci-_.html (accessed 15 February 2018).

Surzhyk, L. (2017). Chotyry miliardy na plahiat [in Ukr. *Four billions on plagirism]. Zderkalo tyzhnia.* 1143-1144, 20–26 May 2017, Available at: https://dt.ua/SCIENCE/chotiri-milyardi-na-plagiat-242950_.html (accessed 15 February 2018).

Swanepoel, S. (2010). The assessment of the quality of science education textbooks: Conceptual framework and instruments for analysis. Available at: http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/4041/thesis_swanepoel_s.pdf (accessed 13 May 2019).

UERA (2016). History. Available at https://uera.org.ua/en/about-us/history (accessed 7 May 2019).

UERA (2018). Ukrainian teacher in the mirror of the all-Ukrainian survey by TALIS methodology. Available at https://uera.org.ua/en/node/85 (accessed 7 May 2019).

Watkins, C. and Mortimore, P. (1999). Pedagogy: What do we know. In P. Motrimore (ed.) *Understanding pedagogy and its impact on learning*, London: SAGE, pp. 1–19.

Williams, J. (2014) *(Re)Constructing Memory: School textbooks and the imagination of the nation*. Boston: Sense Publishers.

World Bank (2003). Ukraine: Education reform policy note (English). Available at http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/348821468313765642/Ukraine-Education-reform-policy-note (accessed 15 February 2018).

Zvynyackivska, Z. (2012a). No comment. Available at: https://life.pravda.com.ua/columns/2012/12/21/118047/ (accessed 15 February 2018).

Zvynyackivska, Z. (2012b). Words starting with 'H' or the new Ukrainian ABC book. Available at https://life.pravda.com.ua/columns/2012/11/28/116532/ (accessed 15 February 2018).

DATA SOURCES:

Fitsula, M. (2009). *Pedagogy: Textbook. 3rd Edition.* Kyiv: Academic Press.

Paschenko, M. and Krasnoshtan, I. (2014). *Pedagogy: Textbook.* Kyiv: Academic Literature Centre.

Sysoyeva, S. and Krystopchuk, T. (2013). *Methodology of Scientific-pedagogical research: Textbook.* Rivne: Vydavnytstvo Oberehy. Available at http://elibrary.kubg.edu.ua/9021/1/Metodologiya_naukovo-pedagogichnikh_doslidzhen.pdf (accessed 16 February 2018).

Volkova, M. (2012). *Pedagogy: Textbook. 4rd Edition.* Academic press: Kyiv.