Phenomenon of a Pupil's Pedagogical Characterization in Vasyl Sukhomlynsky's Heritage

Oleksandr Mikhno

The article is proved that Vasyl Sukhomlynsky's views on the phenomenon of pupil's pedagogical characteristics evolved in parallel with the development of the pedagogical world outlook of the scientist, which is clearly reflected in the content of the characteristics made by the teachers of the team headed by him: insight into mental processes, thoughtful analysis and finding out the causes of complex and sometimes contradictory student's character traits, and certain recommendations on ways of improving student's character.

On the basis of the analysis of the minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council and the psychological seminar of the Pavlysh secondary school, stored in the funds of the Pedagogical-memorial museum of V. Sukhomlynsky (Pavlysh village, Kirovohrad region), the author explained the purpose, organizational features, structure and content of the seminar meetings effectiveness of this form of studying the student's personality, revealed the role of V. Sukhomlynsky as the organizer and leader of the seminar.

It is stated that in the high efficiency of the activity of the seminar was clearly reflected in the content of pedagogical characteristics of students, marked by deep penetration into the essence of mental processes, thoughtful analysis and clarification of the reasons for complex and sometimes contradictory student's character traits, and certain recommendations on ways of improving student's character.

Keywords: *Vasyl Sukhomlynsky, pedagogical characteristics, psychological seminar, student's study.*

Introduction

Educational Heritage of V. Sukhomlynsky has still attracted the attention of many researchers, not only teachers, but also philosophers, psychologists, sociologists and other scientists (M. Antonets (2002), L. Berezivska (2010), V. Kremen (2009), O. Petrenko (2011), O. Savchenko

(2012), O. Sukhomlynska (2012) and others). This indefinite interest is due, first of all, to the fact that V. Sukhomlynsky «revived, developed and enriched the ideas of classical pedagogy» (G. Klochek) at the cost of his own life, and therefore his scientific and pedagogical heritage is a source of modern, personally oriented education; its humanistic paradigm was formed primarily by his writings and practical experience. This is recognized not only by domestic but also by foreign scholars, justifying the Ukrainian teacher's belonging to the European humanist tradition in education (A. Kokeril, Australia) and named him «a harbinger of humanistic pedagogy» (V. Iffert, Germany), the «humanist ascetism». M. Boguslavskii, Russia). In addition, scientists in pedagogy in the whole world mark that the unique combination of an experienced practitioner, a successful teacher-administrator, a shrewd psychologist, a true writer and a true scholar in the person of Vasyl Olexandrovykh promotes the actualization of V. Sukhomlynsky's heritage. It should be emphasized that the organic synthesis of pedagogy and psychology in V. Sukhomlynsky's practical activity was the key to the amazing pedagogical success, which was crowned by a noble by design and exceptionally complex pedagogical experiment, which he brilliantly implemented at Pavlysh secondary school. It was V. Sukhomlynsky who in his own aphoristic manner defined the interdependence of the two sciences in the educational process: «Actually, without psychology there is no pedagogy. In case comparing pedagogy with the workshop, psychology is tools in the workshop; there are no tools or they are not good – the walls themselves will remain from the workshop. It is very often happens in schools» (Sukhomlynsky, 1984). Considering that «psychology is a real compass in the practical work of the team» (Sukhomlynsky, 1977, p. 455), V. Sukhomlynsky strongly encouraged teachers to deepen their knowledge at psychology in order to comprehensively understand the student's personality and to compile the pedagogical characteristics of the student on this basis. For the same purpose a psychological seminar was organized by V. Sukhomlynsky in the Pavlysh School in 1965, for the first experiment in the USSR in the secondary education system. Nowadays there are no special researches of V. Sukhomlynsky's views on the pedagogical student's characteristic and the activity of the psychological seminar, although the problem of introducing the achievements of psychological and pedagogical science into school practice is a priority now, and the need to take into account the psychological student's characteristic of all school-aged students in training process is doubtless.

Analysis of recent research and publications

Analyzing researches and publications devoted to the studying of the student's personality in V. Sukhomlynsky's heritage, we should note that in most of them the issues of pedagogical characterization and activity of the psychological seminar are being considered fragmentarily, only in connection with other problems: for example, the researches of L. Berezovskaya «The principle of individual approach to students in the creative heritage of V. Sukhomlynsky and O. Zakharenko» (Berezovska, 2010), S. Belitskaya «Relationship between teacher and student in the pedagogical heritage of V. Sukhomlynsky» (Biletska, 1994), S. Brychok «The Problem of Studying the Personality of a Schoolboy in the Pedagogical Heritage of Vasyl Sukhomlynsky» (Brychok, 2011) and others. Despite the fact that these scientists touch the problem of pedagogical characterization and psychological seminar of V. Sukhomlynsky partially, substantiating its importance in the context of their own research, we see their merit in actualization of this problem in the modern pedagogical discourse.

The memoirs of contemporaries of the well-known Pavlysh School teacher are the important sources for our research: they highlights some special features of the seminar (All Life – School, 1993; Memories of Sukhomlynsky, 1990). Thus, V. Sviatovets mentioned a conversation in the Research Institute of Pedagogy of the USSR in 1968, in which Vasil called the seminar an «interesting, extremely useful form of teaching» for teachers, briefly outlined the topics of meetings, and also spoke about one of the tasks of the seminar: «teacher's improvement should be controlled, directed, focused on solving the most the most hot problems of pedagogy. Many such issues have not been given due attention in science» (Memories of Sukhomlynsky, 1990, p. 221-212). We would like to emphasize that such memoirs also contain especially valuable facts for clarifying V. Sukhomlynsky's role as the organizer of such kind of seminar. These aspects of the problem consider being extremely important, as it is widely recognized that the effectiveness of the team, and especially of the collective creative activity, depends first of all on the manager's work.

E. Natanzon's manual «The Difficult Child and the Pedagogical Collective» (1984) is the only research in which some aspects of the psychological seminar, in particular the compilation of students' characteristics are covered in details; the author submits the full text of two minutes of the seminars dated 13.09.1967 and 03.12.1968, and two examples of psychological and pedagogical student's characteristics which are briefly analysed. However, taking into account the subject of his research, the author chooses and analyses the minutes of the meetings, which discussed

the issues of «difficult children». This example narrows the content of the workshop, which was much wider. Among the organizational features of the seminar, E. Natanzon (1984) distinguishes its systematic nature (once or twice a month), the participation of all members of the team, and, in fact, the content of the meeting: discussion of two issues – reports of a theoretical nature and characteristics of one or two «difficult children». The question of the beginning of the seminar, the purpose and tasks of its activity, the range of issues discussed remained out of the researcher's; the frequency of the seminar should be clarified.

The main source of our research is the minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical councils and the psychological seminar of the Pavlysh School, which are stored in the Pedagogical-Memorial Museum of V.O. Sukhomlynsky (Pavlysh, Kirovohrad region) (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school), as well as scientific and pedagogical works, articles, letters of V. Sukhomlynsky (Sukhomlynsky, 1953, 1967, 1977).

The Purpose of the Article

Based on the analysis of the above sources, we intend to clarify V. Sukhomlynsky's views on the student's pedagogical characteristics, purpose, organizational features, structure and content of psychological seminar meetings, and its role in the studying of student's nature, and the role of V. Sukhomlynsky as the organizer and leader of the seminar.

The main materials

First of all, we would like to emphasize that the basis of the conceptual idea of our research was the opinion of O. Sukhomlynska said that «unlike many contemporaries and predecessors, Vasyl Olexandrovych was a teacher-practitioner, creator of an experimental and author's school, where pedagogical ideas were tested ...» (Sukhomlynska, 2012, p.22). We believe that it is precisely on the basis of a combination of scientific theory and school practice V. Sukhomlynsky developed an idea to organize a psychological seminar for teachers.

Educational scientist attached psychology of great importance in the organization of educational process, constantly quoted in his writings M. Pirogov, K. Ushinsky, P. Blonsky and Soviet psychologists S. Rubinstein, O. Leontiev, L. Zankov, P. Zinchenko, G. Kostyuk. Considering that the director of the school should be a mediator between science and practice, Vasil Olexandrovych consistently built a harmonious system of psychological education of teachers of the Pavlysh School, in which we are

divided into several stages. Initially (1948-1960) Director involves individual teachers to read psychological literature («real teacher – bibliophile» – the golden rule of the teaching staff of the school): «At council at meetings tell teachers about the new researches of phycologists, psychological books demonstrate on the book-stand «Book novelties» in the teacher's room – read, think, study» (Sukhomlynsky, 1977, p. 455). During this period V. Sukhomlynsky rethinks such a phenomenon as the pedagogical of a student's characteristic.

The problem of studying the personality of the student and composing characteristics on this basis was the main point in V. Sukhomlynsky practice as a director of Pavlysh School almost from the first years of his work. Thus, in the minutes of the meeting of the pedagogical council of 15.01.1950 we read: «Analysis of pedagogical characteristics of students (report the class teachers: Sukhomlynska G.I., Levitsky P.P., Skochko V.A.)» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1949-1951). And further: «Having heard the pedagogical characteristics, the pedagogical council notes that these characteristics are drawn up correctly, they cover all traits of student's character and successfully marked individual features and traits of character of students. The Pedagogical Council obliges all class teachers to study each student in depth and to write comprehensive, broad characteristics» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1949-1951). The decision of the Pedagogical Council of 22.04.1952 stated: «Having heard the information of the director of the school V. Sukhomlynsky on the compilation of pedagogical characteristics of pupils, the pedagogue decides to oblige all class teachers to compile pedagogical characteristics of pupils of their classes by the end of the academic year. Specify in the specifications:

1. Health, pupils' home living conditions.
2. The way a student prepares homework.
3. Students' memory features.
4. Explain the features of behaviour.
5. Student's capacities and inclinations.

6. Outline specific ways to improve student's progress» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1951-1952, p. 31).

It should be noted that by the mid-1950s V. Sukhomlynsky was an advocate of the «school of learning» (Sukhomlynska, 2012, p. 17), with its focus on a strong basic component of knowledge and skills, the predominance of students' mental work. This is reflected in the views of the teacher on the content of pedagogical characteristics: the proposed scheme

provides the student's characterization as a subject of educational activity, which covered primarily intellectually – volitional complex of traits (skills, capacities and abilities), which undoubtedly implies the understanding the student as a personality. Status, value orientation, motives of behaviour and, finally, the nature of the student are evaluated in dependence on his results in studying.

In 1953 V. Sukhomlynsky published an article «Pedagogical Characterization of the Student», where he substantiated his own views on the content and purpose of the characteristic. «Individual peculiarities first of all are the peculiarities of mastering the educational material. At each stage of teaching, the teacher should have an idea of how the student is learning the material, how he memorizes it and learns the rules. In this characterization should be included students' memory features, his or her work at the lessons in the classroom and the way of his or her doing the home work» (Sukhomlynsky, 1953, p. 48). However, the teacher warns against categorical definitions, emphasizing that the individual characteristics of the student is not something unchanged, permanent. They change, and therefore the pedagogical characteristic of the student should also be changed: «It should outline the student's development prospects in the future, and his or her growth prospects. The key to the pedagogical characteristic should be an indication of how the student's abilities develop and what else the teacher should do to make the student better absorb the program material» (Sukhomlynsky, 1953, p. 48).

Giving several examples of students' characteristics, V. Sukhomlynsky notes that in the process of composing characteristics, teachers of Pavlysh School follow the fact that each student is able to study well if the teacher correctly defines his abilities and develops positive qualities, and eliminates the negative ones. In student's characteristic should include records of «the results of daily observations on the readiness of the student for lessons, learning and memorizing educational material» (Sukhomlynsky, 1953, p. 48). For example, in the characteristic of a 5th grade student P.L., class teacher M. Lisak defines the individual peculiarities of the pupil as follows: «The pupil perceives each new concept not immediately but after a comparison with the known one. Each new concept he tries to deny at first, finding in it what is supposed to be inconsistent with previous knowledge. She absorbs new material with some difficulties, if it does not find a connection with the known. Observations show that every missed lesson, every lost concept seriously affects a student's success. Teachers should carefully track the process of studying to be sure that there are no gaps, passes in the system of learning» (Sukhomlynsky, 1953, p. 48).

As the director of Pavlysh School, V. Sukhomlynsky introduced into the practice of the team the discussion of pedagogical characteristics of students at the meetings of teachers who teach in this class, and some characteristics – at the meetings of the pedagogical council. Such kind of collective discussion, according to Vasyl Olexandrovych, prompted teachers to study students more deeply and comprehensively, helped them in reaching a common opinion about what individual features should be studied in the pupil's personality.

At the beginning of the 1950s, a clear methodology for drawing up a pedagogical characteristic was developed at Pavlysh School. The material for it was the observation of the process of mastering program material at the lesson by the student, the process of acquiring practical skills and worldview forming. Teachers studied not only the students' answers in the lesson, but also the questions they asked. The results of these observations, recorded in the teacher's diary, were analyzed at the end of the academic year by comparing the student's characteristic in the last days of the academic year with that recorded at the beginning and in the middle of this year. Observations on the work of the student at home during homework were also taken into account. After discussing the characteristics at the meeting of teachers of this class, they were finally edited, and some of them were analyzed at the meeting of the pedagogical council (Sukhomlynsky, 1953, p. 49).

According to V. Sukhomlynsky, the main task of the characteristic is «to be a means of further improving the student's success» (Sukhomlynsky, 1953, p. 49). Therefore, it is natural that the pedagogical characteristics drawn up by the teachers of the Pavlysh elementary school in the first half of the 1950s are distinguished by a certain rationalism, which is explained by the teachers' focus on students' mental development. Based on the analysis of 50 pedagogical characteristics of the leavers of Pavlysh School in 1954, we reach the conclusions: frequent of fixing the same traits in the characteristics of the different students are very high: in the characteristics of 50 graduates 28 times mentions the trait «attentive», 25 – «persistent in overcoming difficulties in learning» and «clear and accurate at doing homework», noted some specific features of speech – 43, memory – 37, activity – 23, diligence – 27 times and so on. Teachers, as a rule, say only that, which activity tends student («like physical work», «has aptitude for the subject of handicraft» «interested in radio engineering»). The qualitative characterization of the abilities and the degree of their manifestation are usually not noted. In addition, the characteristics are very concise (maximum – half a page of handwriting) (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1953-1954, p. 83).

As we see it, among students' traits noted by teachers, the main features are cognition, attitudes to learning, characteristics of learning activities, volition qualities. This fact confirms our conclusion that teachers perceive student primarily as a subject of academic activities, and not as a person.

V. Sukhomlynsky himself, confessing that «at first it was very difficult for us to prepare the pedagogical characteristic of the child» (Sukhomlynsky, 1977, p. 447), however, was firmly convinced: «The work of every teacher, headmaster of a school, school head teacher over a pedagogical characteristic of a child is the basics of a pedagogical culture. Without knowing the child there is no school, no education, no true teacher and pedagogical team» (Sukhomlynsky, 1977, p.449). In the late 1950s – early 1960s, V. Sukhomlynsky was put on a scientific basis to study the student and compose his pedagogical characteristics. It was «the constant thoughtful work of each teacher teaching a child with his or her complex spiritual world, with his or her joys and sadness; and psychological analysis, observation, and thorough examination are the foundation of educational characteristics» (Sukhomlynsky, 1977, p. 455).

The headmaster of Pavlysh School kept the tendency to widen and deepen the psychological education of teachers from the very beginning of 1960s. V. Sukhomlynsky and most of the teachers spoke at the pedagogical councils with lectures devoted to topical issues of pedagogical psychology. «... All of us at every step face the psychological and pedagogical problems in educational work. Here, in this area of school life, there are too many problems which cannot be solved without psychological knowledge (e.g. what kind of the student's acts should be discussed in the class and what is impossible to make the debate topic for the general discussion in the class; what is the pedagogical tact in the process of knowledge assessment) ... Some issues are brought to the discussion of the pedagogical council, with some questions we turn to research centres» (Sukhomlynsky, 1977).

In the middle of 1960s years V. Sukhomlynsky was not satisfied by existing forms of psychological education, because they on his mind did not enhance the growth of culture of pedagogical activity Pavlysh School teachers. The creation a psychological seminar in September 1965, on the initiative of V. Sukhomlynsky was result of a creative search for optimal ways to increase the level of professional skills of teachers.

The start of work of the psychological seminar at Pavlysh School is considered to be fundamental. The fact is that nowadays in the scientific literature we find states that in the USSR, the first attempts to use psychology in the educational process of secondary school were made in Estonia by psychologists H. Liimetz and Y. Sierd in the 1970s (Prikhodzhan,

Tolstyykh, 1987, p.174). Unfortunately, this thesis is also present in modern Ukrainian textbooks on practical psychology; instead, the name of V. Sukhomlynsky and the experience of his innovative activity in this field are not even mentioned (Dutkiewicz, 2010, p. 87). In no way diminishing the role of Estonian scientists in the implementation of scientific research in school practice of education and upbringing, we still insist: V. Sukhomlynsky was the first who introduced into the system of work of the secondary school the achievement of psychological science, besides in an explicit form of a psychological seminar. The first meeting of the seminar under his chairmanship was held at the Pavlysh School on September 14, 1965 (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1953-1954).

The psychological seminar was, without exaggeration, the favourite's brainchild of Vasyl Olexandrovykh, as evidenced by his heartfelt experiences, emotional expressions: «We have a constantly working psychological seminar. This is, as we can say, a commonwealth of caring, restless, and insatiable in their desire to know thinkers» (Sukhomlynsky, 2019). «Psychological seminar is the same as the council of the most intelligent, experienced doctors... In the course of a psychological seminar we study a person» (Sukhomlynsky, 2019). «Heated debate about child, psychological seminar that we dedicate a child – this is, in our belief, the very essence of studying the child, creative laboratory of the teaching staff» (Sukhomlynsky, 1977, p. 447-448). From the above statements, the purpose of the seminar, which V. Sukhomlynsky himself defined as «human research», in other words, is a comprehensive study of the student's personality. It is clear that the effectiveness of such study depended on the professional skill of teachers, the level of their psychological knowledge and analytical skills. So, the purpose and objectives of the psychological seminar can be formulated as follows: improving the professional skills of teachers by deepening psychological knowledge about the child in order to comprehensively study the personality of the student.

Regarding the terms of the seminar, it was conducted at different intervals: initially twice a month on Mondays, then – «about once every one and a half months» (Sukhomlynsky, 1977, p. 447). Based on the analysis of 47 protocols of psychological seminars (Appendix A), we came to the next conclusions. Structural seminar consisted usually of two parts: a Director's theoretical report with the following discussion by teachers in the aspect of the application of theoretical positions in the practice of teaching – educational process Pavlysh School; one or two detailed psycho – pedagogical characteristics of students, which was a carefully prepared report with the emphasis on the psychological portrait, and made with a focus on

how positive is the child; and which can be used for constructing further educational work with a child. During 1965-1970, V. Sukhomlynsky himself conducted 40 seminars, at which 31 reports of Vasyl Olexandrovykh were heard and discussed, and 23 characteristics were analyzed. At times, only theoretical issues (such seminars 21) were the subject of discussion, seven meetings were devoted solely to the psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the students, and at 12 seminars both issues were discussed.

All the reports presented at the seminar by V. Sukhomlynsky relate to the child's mental development and are aimed at comprehensive study of the student's personality by the teacher, improvement of educational work in school: «Questions of the psychological culture of the lesson» (01/26/1966), «Mental peculiarities of adolescents» (13.10.1966) .1966), «Teaching students to manage their desires» (02/25/1967), «Work as an important condition for a full moral and mental education» (10/23/1968), «Discipline and a sense of duty» (11/01/69), «The problem the relationship between teacher and students» (20.01.1970) and others.

Emphasis in this aspect is the meeting of the psychological seminar, which took place on 13.11.1968. V. Sukhomlynsky delivered a report «Teaching love of mother tongue», where he defined the psychological and pedagogical specificities at language teaching taking into account the age peculiarities of students: – two or three last preschool years and four or five first school life years – it is at the same time a special period of the most turbulent mental development of the child. So, the most important period for nurturing love for the native word is elementary grades» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1968-1969, p. 10). Impressive is the profound psychology of the report, the vision of the deep connections of language with cognitive processes: «Teaching language is not just a transfer of knowledge, practical skills. This is above all the education of the mind, the painstaking carving and moulding of the most subtle features of a person's face. From words and thoughts begins the formation of man; the thought embodied in the word raised us above nature. Above all things and phenomena language teaching is first and foremost human sciences» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1968-1969); «Love is a feeling; to cultivate love for the mother tongue means to affirm feelings of admiration, wonder, excitement» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1953-1954).

Justifying the leading role of the fairy tale in fostering love for the mother tongue, the scholar-teacher emphasizes: «The emotional nuances of words reach children best in fairy tales. A fairy tale is a window through

which the ray of the native word penetrates into the soul of the child and leaves a deep mark forever» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1953-1954). Writing fairy tales, especially at a younger school age, according to V. Sukhomlynsky, is one of the most effective methods of language teaching, language development, and at the same time the formation of a creative personality: «Creating a child begins with a fairy tale. Children must be taught to compose fairy tales. What is created in the elementary grades, the student will never create, becoming a teenager» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1953-1954).

It should be emphasized that the theoretical provisions of the director's reports were further used by teachers in the process of studying students and drawing on this basis psychological and pedagogical characteristics. We will illustrate this with excerpts from the characteristics that were discussed at the seminars: «A girl came to school ready. She knew all the letters, counted in the range of 20, knew many fairy tales she had heard and taught from her grandmother» (from the characteristics of a student of the 1st grade, Svetlana N., composed by Voroshylo P., seminar dated 12.03.1969) (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1955, p. 46); «She did not hear the grandmother's or mother's tales, no one taught her to read poetry, did not speak to a child seriously, and did not learn to focus on stories. Therefore, the language of the girl is extremely poor and the attention is unstable» (from the characteristic of the 2nd grade student Valentina O., composed by V.P. Novitskaya, seminar dated 16.04.1969) (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1968-1969, p. 49). Sometimes in the psychological and pedagogical characteristics of students we observe a direct quotation of V. Sukhomlynsky report: «Child did not prepare for school at all. In childhood, no one told fairy tales, and the emotional nuances of words reach children only in fairy tales. They penetrate into the soul of the child and forever leave a deep mark» (from the characterization of the pupil of the third grade Mykola F., composed by O.A. Malolitko, seminar of October 22, 1969) (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1969-1971, p.17).

A vivid testimony to V. Sukhomlynsky's deep knowledge of personality psychology, his amazing understanding of his inner world, and the motivating motives of human actions is the report «On the Education of Conscience» (seminar of 22.01.1969), where the scientist discusses the differences of moral education and teaching: we can immediately get feedback on how knowledge is learned. While educating, we do not know, we cannot immediately see how our influence is transformed in the inner

spiritual world of the individual» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1968-1969, p. 29). V. Sukhomlynsky believed that a great disadvantage of practical educational work is that teachers see the educational power to bring the moral truths into the minds of students, to make them the object of thought. Indeed, this is a very important stage of education, but this education is just beginning. Aware of the intentionality of moral values (the complex connection of values and their carriers), the scientist emphasizes that in the process of education of conscience, the teacher's knowledge of the student's personality takes place, even more, without such knowledge it is impossible to bring up moral values at all, and therefore, moral education should be purposeful and taking into account the individual characteristics of students. The purpose of education is «to make moral truth a personal striving, a desire. Conscience as a sense of moral responsibility is nurtured and expressed, revealed and formed only in activity, in behaviour, in circumstances in which moral truth becomes a personal point of view, a line of behaviors; every act of man has its own primary source, the impulse to push the inner spiritual forces of man, his convictions, emotions» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1968-1969, p. 29).

An analysis of the content of V. Sukhomlynsky's reports leads to the conclusion that the innovation of the psychological seminar consisted not only of a new form of student study for high school, but also of issues that were addressed by the principal and became the subject of discussion with further implementation. Many of these issues are relevant today. For example, in the report «The process of understanding knowledge in lessons» (seminar of 13.02.1969), the problem of continuous growth of the volume of information and the inability of students to work with it: «In our time on the way to successful mastering of knowledge, comprehensive school faces a serious obstacle: with each passing year, the flow of information increases, the sources of information become more (cinema, television). The threat is not the information itself, but the habits of perceiving what is interesting» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1968-1969, p. 34). Offering ways of forming students' ability to work with educational information (short recording of a teacher's story, working on concepts that are learned for the first time, their understanding), the teacher-emphasizes: «It is necessary to set students to work in the lesson» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1968-1969). Obviously, it is a question of motivation of educational activity, and here again we see the innovation of V. Sukhomlynsky, since this problem in the 1960s was only beginning to

develop in psychological science (L. Bozhovich, P. Halperin, O. Leontiev, A. Maslow, G. Allport).

Skilfully possessing special pedagogical insight, as well as a scientific vision of psychological and pedagogical problems and optimal ways of solving them, V. Sukhomlynsky at the meetings of psychological seminars raises problems that are only beginning to be outlined as prospects for psychological studies of personality. Thus, in 1972, psychologist L. Bozovic (student L. Vygotsky) in the work «Study motivation behaviour children and adolescents' learning needs poses the problem: «A complete formation of the human person crucial way depends on what is necessary will take the form of self-motion ... This provision should be particularly emphasized, as pedagogy does not currently address the problem of educating needs: it is not put forward as a special task of education . There is no such section in the textbooks of pedagogy, nor is it in the educational program of the school. As a result, there is no developed methodology for educating needs and motives» (Dutkevich, 2010, p. 34). But V. Sukhomlynsky actualized the problem of upbringing needs in the late 1960s: the report «Discipline and a sense of duty» (seminar of 11.01.1969) stated that in many families parents satisfy all the wishes of children that «leads to ugly distortions of needs, desires and pleasures. In children and adolescents, only those needs are stated, the pleasures of which are pleasurable» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1968-1969, p. 26). In developing this problem, the scientist claimed that «education culture desires to largely determined by , as a wise harmony set in life between the material needs and the formation , development , satisfaction of spiritual» (Sukhomlynsky, 1967, p.77). Therefore, the teacher should nurture the diverse material and spiritual needs of the students and seek their harmonious development. V. Sukhomlynsky, not denying the importance of material needs , gave priority to the needs of a qualitatively different order: «Man by his nature is not only a consumer , and satisfaction of urgent needs is only a prerequisite, important, decisive, but still only a prerequisite for happiness» (Sukhomlynsky, 1977, p.107). According to V. Sukhomlynsky, the first spiritual need – knowledge , and the highest – need another person as carriers of spiritual values , so you should «teach a child has to give himself to others, to experience the need for a person» (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1968-1969, p. 32).

As mentioned above, the main purpose of the theoretical reports and the whole seminar was to study the child thoroughly. The peculiar result of this study of the student's personality at a certain stage of study was a psychological and pedagogical characteristic. This pedagogical phenomenon

given special attention to the psychological seminar: 40 meetings held V. Sukhomlynsky, psychological and educational characteristics of schoolchildren discussed at 19. Each pedagogical phenomenon, including psychological and pedagogical characteristics, according to Vasily Olexandrovych – is a logical unity, unity three factors: what gives life itself (a child comes to school with objectively existing traits), what the teacher does, and what will be achieved: «Only then does the teacher become an active force influencing the personality the pupil, when he, the teacher, does not record everything that happens, and he actively influences the pedagogical phenomenon, creates it» (Sukhomlynsky, 1977, p.473). These postulates and determined the content of psychological and pedagogical characteristics, which usually began with the coverage of the impact of the family on the child's development, then – determined the student's temperament, analyzed his abilities and inclinations, highlighted the influence of the teacher on their formation and correction, completed the characteristic, as a rule, outlining activities aimed at improving personal qualities and forming positive traits of the student. Indicative in this regard is the psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the pupil of the third grade of Alexander G., which was considered at the psychological seminar 16. 04.1969. (Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school, 1968-1969, p.51) at the beginning she presents the family (father, mother and older sister) and states that the boy was left unattended by his parents, so he came to school unprepared, «did not know any poems and tales.» Then the teacher notes and substantiates in detail in the character of the student traits of sanguine-choleric temperament: «Always marked by vigorous and sharp movements. Insufficiency of brake processes explains motor intolerance. The boy is not restrained, shows sharply his feelings, inattentive to the surrounding events, emotions are shallow, short-lived. There is no perseverance and focus. «The pupil's attention is defined as unstable, and this statement is not only specified by the teacher, but also clarifies the reason: «He cannot focus on a particular object or activity for a long time. The reason for this is lack of will. Labour is important for nurturing will and character. She has to enter the life of a child even a few years before entering school ... And parents did not teach Sasha to work responsibilities in the family. At home, the boy still does not do any hard work for him. Even bringing a bucket of water to the house is not a well-developed, energetic, strong boy». The following are the features of a student's speech, again with the specification and clarification of the reason: «Language is poor. Into national and emotional speech are also poor; the boy has a small stock of words. He answers the questions clearly, often makes the wrong accents, builds the sentence incorrectly. An important feature of language is its

expressiveness, which is brought up by the expressive reading of poems and other literary and artistic works. The book enriches the person most... Sashko reads little. He does not have his own library». But «the boy goes to the school library... every day we read fairy tales and interesting stories. Sashko also participates, but he is more inclined to listen to someone. What is interesting is listening carefully, with interest. «Regarding learning activities, the boy does «easy tasks» on his own and tries to do them as best he can. And with more complex – can not cope without help. Sashko knows how to calculate examples, but he can't think of his own task. Solving the problem begins with a deep awareness of it, and Alexander often during the lesson is inattentive, misses the explanation of the teacher». The characteristic is extremely well analyzed observation of the student during the game: «Play is the main activity of children. Alexander loves to play. The goal is to successfully play the game, to defeat the partner. And almost always becomes a winner. But qualities such as friendship and friendship formed during the game are not peculiar to him. He can deceive a friend who understands little in this game. In particular, I watched a lot when Sasha plays billiards with the first-graders ... sure to displace the weaker student and take his place. » At the end of the characteristic, the teacher outlines the activities and sets tasks that are aimed at forming positive traits of the student's character: «Every lesson should be followed by this student so as not to lose sight of good character qualities. To cultivate restraint and self-control. In the education of these qualities, the word must play a big role. To show the boy the positive and negative aspects of his behavior, to help him to understand them in order to change his behaviour ... To assign cases that require endurance, diligence, focus. Constantly take an individual approach».

As you can see, the student's understanding of the teacher has a creative character, which is manifested in the ability to distinguish the individual identity of the student's personality, tendencies of its development. Characteristically, the teacher identifies the cause – effect relationships, which allows you to record not only the visible evidence of behaviour student, but to identify also the underlying causes of its development, to disclose the contents of the controversial process, in which emerging and developing personality of the student . It should also be noted that the characteristic clearly traces the teacher's use of the knowledge obtained at the psychological seminar, in particular theoretical provisions of V. Sukhomlynsky's reports «Psychic features of adolescents», «The process of understanding knowledge in lessons», «The role of reading in mental education and spiritual life» «Work as an Important Condition for Full Moral and Mental Education». In these and other reports, Vasily Olexandrovych concentrated the latest achievements of psychological science with the aim

of their practical implementation into the teacher's work, because the speeches of the director at the seminar were addressed primarily to the pedagogical staff of the Pavlovian school. Teacher G. Vovchenko points out that «it was not necessary to re-read the stacks of methodical literature, but only to listen carefully to his report, speech, to receive valuable guidance and advice» (Memories of Sukhomlynsky, 1990, p.52).

One of the main reasons for the effectiveness of a psychological seminar as a form of student learning is the role of its leader. And not only in the organizational and administrative activities of the headmaster, the preparation of meetings, thorough reports, but above all in the personality of V. Sukhomlynsky. According to the memoirs of his contemporaries, the psychological stardom of Vasily Olexandrovyich was phenomenal, he possessed passionate energy of a deeply creative nature, an amazing ability to ignite, wing his colleagues in their difficult search for pedagogical truth, he had a characteristic trait in which to notice others.]. Thus, V. Haluzinsky, recalling the visit to the Pavlovsk school, gives the following episode: «In the teacher's bulletin board I read: On April 16 at 5 pm there will be a psychological seminar» Discussion of the psychological and pedagogical characteristics of Mikhail Borisenko. – Vasily, what did this Mouse deserve such an honour for? – Absolutely nothing. Said the director seriously. – I took the first-best class journal, the first name on the list and suggested that it be noticed, invisibly, at a psychological seminar. That is the case – an invisible child, but in it lies the whole inner world» (Memories of Sukhomlynsky y, 1990, p.102). As the organizer and leader of the seminar, V. Sukhomlynsky also gave valuable methodological guidelines. The teacher of the Paul School S.O. Sukhomlynsky in his «Memories of a Brother» mentions: «Much attention was paid to Vasily Olexandrovyich working with parents, studying the personality of the child. Unfortunately, not all teachers are engaged in psychological and pedagogical observations of children. On his recommendation, I started a special magazine, where each student class was given a few pages; there were records of a family where the student lives, its atmosphere, relationships, and hobbies. preferences ... Knowledge of this information greatly helped in working with children» (All Life – School: Memories of Contemporaries about V.O. Sukhomlynsky, 1993, p.21-22). The director of the psychological seminar and the activities of the teachers for studying the students and compiling psychological and pedagogical characteristics were planned several years in advance. In the Perspective Plan of Ideological and Educational Work of Paul's Secondary School (1968-1974), in the section «Formation of students' personality» we read: «To study the psychological and pedagogical characteristics of children. To ensure that every teacher has a deep knowledge of the features of mental

activity, emotional life, type of nervous system, memory, will, character of his student» (Sukhomlynsky, 1969).

Conclusions and prospects for further research

Thus, on the basis of the analysis of the protocols of the pedagogical councils and the psychological seminar of the Pavlovsk secondary school, the scientific and pedagogical works of V. Sukhomlynsky, the memoirs of the contemporaries of the teacher, we have established that the study of the student's personality and the drawing up of the student's character in the Pavlyk school were based on the scientific basis. It was first discussed in detail at the pedagogical councils, and then in the form of a psychological seminar. The seminar was valid during 1965-1971, and structurally consisted usually of two parts: a theoretical report and consideration of the psychological and pedagogical characteristics of one or two students, followed by discussion and accumulation of collective thought into clear conclusions and recommendations. The high efficiency of the seminar activity was clearly reflected in the content of the psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the students, which are marked by deep penetration into the essence of mental processes, thoughtful analysis and clarification of the reasons for complex and sometimes contradictory manifestations of the student's personality, guidance on ways of improving the character.

The leading role in organizing the seminar and ensuring its effective activity belonged to V. Sukhomlynsky and was due to his purposeful activity of a scientist, teacher, practitioner and headmaster. It should be noted that Vasily Olexandrovykh himself was deeply understood in the subtle movements of the child's soul, quickly and actively entered the child's internal psychological situation, felt his mood, was perfectly oriented in the external manifestations of the psychological state of students of different school age. Giving a comprehensive pedagogical character to a growing man, he distinguished the psychological features of his spiritual world at every stage of mental, moral, emotional and aesthetic development. In view of this, the prospects of further scientific research can be seen in a more detailed study of V. Sukhomlynsky's contribution to child and pedagogical psychology, namely: an analysis of his scientific and pedagogical works with an emphasis on pedagogical characteristics of younger, middle and senior school age.

References

- Antonets, M. Ya. (2002). Native word in the didactic system of V.O. Sukhomlynsky. M.V. Levkivskyi (Ed.), *National education: traditions and innovations in the context of Ivan Ogienko's ideas* (pp. 193–198). Kyiv: Zhytomyr: ZhSPU.
- Berezovskaya, L. (2010). The principle of individual approach to students in the creative heritage of V.O. Sukhomlynsky and O.A. Zakharenko. *Historical and pedagogical almanac*, 1. 20–26.
- Biletska, S.V. (2011). Relations between teacher and student in pedagogical heritage Sukhomlynsky: author's abstract. dissertation ... Cand. ped. of sciences. Kharkiv, 1994.
- Brychok, S.B. (2011). Problem of Studying the Personality of a Schoolboy in the Pedagogical Heritage of Vasyl Sukhomlynsky. *Pedagogical discourse*, 10, 76–79.
- All Life – School: Memories of Contemporaries about V.O. Sukhomlynsky*. (1993). Kirovograd.
- Dutkiewicz, T. V., Savitskaya, O.V. (2010). *Practical Psychology: Introduction to. 2nd species. Educ. Tool*. Kyiv.
- Studying the motivation of behavior of children and adolescents: a collection of articles* / Ed.: L.I. Bozovic. In . Goodwill. Moscow: Pedagogika, 1972. 351 p.
- Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school. 31.10.49–25.06.1951* / Pedagogical Memorial Museum Sukhomlynsky, PPMMS, 1999
- Book of minutes of the meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school. 24.08.51–23.08.52* / Ibid., MSMC 13000, 59 sheets.
- Book of minutes of meetings of the pedagogical council of Pavlovsk school for 1953–54.* / Ibid., LV 13004, 97 sheets.
- Book of minutes of meetings of the Pavlovsk State School Psychological Seminar* / Ibid., LV 12994, 49 pages.
- Book of minutes of the meetings of the Pauline School Psychological Seminar* / Ibid., LV 1655, 40 sheets .
- Book of minutes of the meetings of the psychological seminar of Pavlovsk school. 10/09/1968 – 04/16/1969* / Ibid., LV 1656, 54 sheets.
- Book of minutes of the meetings of the psychological seminar of Pavlovsk school. 09/09/1969 – 09/22/1971* / Ibid., MSPC 1657, 95 sheet
- Natanson, E. S. (1984). *Hard-working schoolboy and pedagogical staff: a guide for the teacher*. Moscow: Education.
- Prikhozhan, A.M., Tolstuh, N.A. (1987). Scientific and practical problems of school psychological service. *Psychology issues*, 4, 174–177.
- Memories of Sukhomlynsky* / Comp. S. P. the Thread. Kyiv, 1990.

- Sukhomlinskaya O.V. Vasylyshyn A. (2012). Sukhomlinsky – scientific biography. *V. Sukhomlinsky in reflection of modern Ukrainian teachers* / Compilation: O. Sukhomlinskaya, O.Ya. Savchenko (pp. 14-24). Lugansk.
- Sukhomlinsky, V.O.. (1953). Pedagogical characteristics of the student. *Public education*. 4. 46-49.
- Sukhomlinsky, V.O. Perspective plan of ideological and educational work of Pavlovian secondary school (1968-1974). *Socialist village* 1969. December 2.
- Sukhomlinsky, V.O. (1976). Problems of upbringing of a fully developed personality. *V.O. Sukhomlinsky. Selected works: in 5 volumes* / ed.: OG Dzeverin (chairman) and others. Kyiv, T.1. 55-207.
- Sukhomlinsky, V.O. Talking with young school principal / *Ibid*. T.4, 391-626.
- Sukhomlinsky, V.O. How to cultivate a love for work? / *There alone*. T . 5. P. 96-108.
- Sukhomlinsky In A. Happiness you create yourself: [Excerpts from letters to EK Andreeva, 1969-1970]. *Teacher's newspaper* . 1984. September 4, January.
- Sukhomlinsky V.O. *Ethics of relations in the pedagogical team of the school*. <http://old.dnpgov.ua/id/id/482>

Appendix A

**Pauline High School Psychological Seminars
(based on the archive of the Pedagogical Memorial Museum
V.O. Sukhomlinsky)**

№	Date of holding	Topic of the meeting (agenda)
1	14.09.65	1. Difficulty in educating a student 5 cl. P. Chernyavsky (reports by the director of the school SUhomlinsky VA) Consideration of the psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student.
2	23.09.65	1. Difficulty in educating a student 2 cl. Akmazikova O. Consideration of the psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student.
3	26.01.66	1. Report of Sukhomlinsky VA «Questions of the psychological culture of the lesson»
4	16.02.66	The conversation about the psychological culture of the lesson continued. The subject of discussion was the question «Ways to ensure active thinking of students in the classroom»
5	24.02.66	1. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 7 cl. Irklia O.

6	13.04.66	1. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of a student 6 cl. Raznichenko O. 2. Speech by Sukhomlynsky VA «Creative works of students»
7	13.10.66	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Psychic features of adolescents»
8	17.11.66	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Means of educational influence on students»
9	21.01.67	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «On the feeling of novelty, emotional culture of the pedagogical process and spiritual interests of students»
10	25.02.67	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Teaching students to manage their desires»
11	16.03.67	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «On the inadmissibility of discussing in the collective individual actions of children, adolescents, boys and girls»
12	19.04.67	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «On the inadmissibility of» strong «» volitional «means of influence on students»
13	13.09.67	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «About the education of heavy children»
14	11.10.67	1. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 4 cl. Red Hat B. 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 4 cl. Vinkovaya V.
15	07.12.67	1. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of a student 4 cl. Stankevich N.
16	24.01.68	1. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 4 cl. Malolitko M.
17	21.02.68	1. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of 5th grade student Onufrienko S.
18	15.03.68	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «On the education of children with pathology of behavior and emotions» 2. Report by KM Zhalenko «Features of pupils' temperament and their consideration in educational work»
19	17.04.68	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Raising love for mother»
20	16.09.68	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Educating the need for knowledge»
21	09.10.68	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Cultivating a sense of personal moral dignity in students»
22	23.10.68	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Work as an Important Condition for Full Moral and Mental Education»
23	13.11.68	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Fostering love for the mother tongue»
24	03.12.68	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Teacher-educator»

25	19.12.68	1. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 5 cl. Fruitless S. 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 2 cl. Gutnik O. 3. Report of Sukhomlynsky V.O. «The role of the team in cultivating the student's respect for himself»
26	11.01.69	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Discipline and a sense of duty»
27	22.01.69	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «On the education of conscience» 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 2 cl. Shepherd O.
28	13.02.69	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «The process of understanding the knowledge in the lessons» 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of preschooler Volovik N. 3. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of preschooler Vorobyova M.
29	12.03.69	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «On the intellectual life of the school» 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of a student of 1 class. Boredom S.
30	16.04.69	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «How to learn poetry and prose by heart» 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 2 cl. Omelchenko V. 3. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 3 cl. Gonchar O.
31	08.09.69	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA About Ethical Conversations and Their Impact on Students' Consciousness and Feelings
32	24.09.69	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Assessment of knowledge as a means of education and detection of pedagogical tact» 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 4 cl. Gubenko V.
33	10/15/69	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Civic Education of Youth»
34	10/22/69	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «The role of reading in the mental education and spiritual life of students» 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 3 cl. Frolov M.
35	12.11.69	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «On nurturing a sensitive, caring, caring attitude to the living and beautiful» 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 7 cl. Yushchenko Yu.

36	03.12.69	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «The most important prerequisites for successful preparation of children for school in preschool years»
37	20.01.70	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «The problem of teacher-student relationships»
38	28.01.70	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «On the education and upbringing of the weak-minded, low-ability, slow-thinking children» 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 6 cl. Polushkin M.
39	04.03.70	1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA Psychological Foundations of Fast Reading 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of a student 8 cl. Difference T.
40	14.04.70	<i>The last seminar conducted by Sukhomlynsky VA</i> 1. Report of Sukhomlynsky VA «Teenage conformism and upbringing of the adolescent team» 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of a student 8 cl. Irkley N.
41	09.16.70	1. Fedorova TG's report Nurturing love for the native word
42	10.28.70	1. Kodak's report MI «Knowledge assessment – both a very delicate and dangerous weapon is needed. Teacher's Pedagogical Skill Shows Ability to Use Assessment »
43	11.23.70	1. Kodak's report MI «Avoiding prejudice in relationships with children»
44	26.01.71	1. Kodak's report MI «The essence of self-education» 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 8 cl. Irklia S.
45	03.03.71	1. Kodak's report MI «Memory efforts and thought efforts in the lesson»
46	14.05.71	1. Kodak's report MI «Ambition, self-love and self-esteem are the subtle» strings «that a teacher needs to be able to play skillfully» 2. Psychological and pedagogical characteristics of the student 4 cl. Colodia S.
47	22.09.71	1. Kodak's report MI «The essence of the basic mental processes and the task of the teacher.