

# **Theoretical Foundations Development of Vocational Pedagogical Education in the 1920s – Early 1930s**

**Lidiya Z. Tenchurina**  
**Moscow State Institute of Physical Culture, Sports and Tourism Named**  
**After Yu. A. Senkevich**

**Vasiliy P. Kosyrev**  
**Moscow State Institute of Culture**

**Pavel A. Silaychev**  
**College of Automobile Transport No. 9**

*The work focuses on studying the theoretical foundations of vocational pedagogical education, developed by scientists, educational management employees, and practicing teachers in the 1920s – early 1930s. This is the stage of system formation of training teachers of particular professional disciplines and industrial training instructors (masters). The purpose of the study is to establish the most significant and conceptual theoretical provisions formulated on the problems of the organization and content of training special teaching staff in the historical period under study. The study results, generalization, and systematization of documents and materials found in archival and library funds related to the formation of a system for training special pedagogical personnel are presented. This study is significant not only for understanding the features of the genesis of the vocational and pedagogical education system as an independent industry in the Russian education system, which successfully developed up to the 2000s, but also for determining the prospects for its development in the new socio-economic and socio-cultural realities.*

*Keywords: professional pedagogical education, theoretical foundations, organizational forms and training content, teacher, professional disciplines, industrial training master*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Professional and pedagogical education (former names: special pedagogical, techno-, agro-, industrial- and engineering pedagogical education), aimed at training teachers of exceptional/professional and polytechnic/general technical disciplines, instructors, and masters of industrial training, has more than 100 summer history. We (Tenchurina, 2000) found that the first attempts to organize special pedagogical personnel training in Russia were undertaken in the second half of the 19th century. It was a small experience of specialized training of teachers and educators for military educational institutions. The formation of the special pedagogical education system began in 1920 – from the time when the Main Committee for Vocational Education (Glavprofobr) was organized under the People’s Commissariat of

Education, and the techno pedagogical department was established there (as part of the pedagogical section). The department employees were assigned tasks:

- Determining the optimal (currently) and promising ways of training special teaching staff;
- Establishing the components of the content of this training within the framework of certain structural and organizational forms of training.

The need for a balanced and well-grounded (both from a theoretical and practical point of view) problem solving determined the participation in the discussion of the problems of “cadres for cadres” not only of employees of the education management but also of educators and practitioners. It was their views, judgments, and opinions on the problems of training teachers of special and general professional disciplines and instructors of industrial training that constituted, in fact, the scientific and theoretical basis for the formation (the 1920s–1930s) and subsequent development of the system of professional and pedagogical education in our country.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study materials were books, articles, essays, and speeches of scientists, employees of the education management, and practicing teachers I. F. Ankudinov (1932), N. I. Barbashova (RSFSR People’s Commissariat of Education, 1930), S. E. Gaisinovich, D. N. Evreinova (1929), A. F. Evstigneeva-Belyakova (1927), I. A. Kairova (1930), F. F. Koroleva (1934), A. A. Krasnovsky (1929a; 1929b), S. Ya. Kupidonova (1928), M. M. Rubinstein (1928), A. Ryndich (1933), N. Shaposhnikov (1931), P. N. Shimbirev (1932). These books were devoted to training special pedagogical personnel and were found by us in the archives and library funds.

Research methods are historical, logical, and comparative analysis, systematization, pedagogical extrapolation.

## RESULTS

Before determining the form or content of training special pedagogical personnel, some of the authors of the studies studied tried to determine a specific list of professional and personal qualities that a teacher of vocational training should possess.

What is the ideal image of a teacher of special and general technical disciplines (as interpreted by individual teachers during the 1920s – early 1930s)?

A well-known scientist, author of scientific works on psychology and pedagogy, M. M. Rubinstein argued that an engineer teacher must be prepared not only for teaching (to be an “educator”), but also for educational, organizational, production, and social pedagogical activities (Rubinstein, 1928). An employee of the Glavprofobra (in the 1920s, deputy head of the pedagogical section) and head of the Professional Pedagogy Department of the Research Institute of Scientific Pedagogy A. F. Evstigneev-Belyakov was convinced that in all professional educational institutions, teachers should only be those who had received higher education in the relevant specialty (Evstigneev-Belyakov, 1927). Teacher of the Higher Pedagogical Courses at the Moscow Higher Technical School. Since 1926, the head of the Industrial Pedagogical Education Section in the Department of Professional Pedagogy of the Research Institute of Scientific Pedagogy S. Ya. Kupidonov, in the development of the position of A. F. Evstigneeva-Belyakova, formulated the requirement for the mandatory work experience (Kupidonov, 1928). S. E. Gaisinovich supplemented this list with the requirement of “possession of one universal (characteristic of a particular industry) profession” (State Archive of the Russian Federation [SARF]: n.d. pp. 21-24).

Considering Russian and foreign experience of training special pedagogical personnel, N. I. Barbashov, S. E. Gaisinovich, I. Dashevsky, D. N. Evreinov, A.F. Evstigneev-Belyakov, I. A. Kairov, F. F. Korolev, A. A. Krasnovsky, S. Ya. Kupidonov, M. M. Rubinstein, and some other authors in their printed works and speeches proposed and substantiated the following options for organizational forms of training vocational training teachers and instructors (masters) of industrial training. They are the following:

- One- and two-year pedagogical courses – “institutions” and courses – “retrofit”;

- Two- and three-year interfaculty pedagogical departments as additional structural units in discipline-specific universities;
- Specialized (industrial, agricultural, etc.) pedagogical institutes and faculties with a four- or five-year study;
- Pedagogization of vocational schools;
- Instructor (industrial instructor) technical schools.

Pedagogical courses – “institutions” were as independent educational institutions. Courses – “institutions” and courses – “retrofit” were for the training of persons with higher industry (technical, agricultural, economic, artistic, etc.) education. A. F. Evstigneev-Belyakov (SARF, n.d. pp. 6-9); Evstigneev-Belyakov, (1927), M. M. Rubinstein (Rubinstein, 1928), I. A. Kairov (Kairov, 1930), S. Ya. Kupidonov (1928), A. A. Krasnovsky (1929b), and others viewed them as a temporary, forced measure – in the face of a shortage of teaching staff. At the same time, preference was given to pedagogical “retrofit” courses opened at universities.

A.F. Evstigneev-Belyakov defined the features of the organization of the educational process in these courses, pointing out that:

- “Core” of psychological and pedagogical training should be courses in psychology, pedagogy, and methods of teaching special disciplines;
- It is necessary to attach secondary and lower (primary) vocational educational institutions to pedagogical courses to organize the pedagogical practice of future teachers;
- To improve the quality of the educational process in the “retrofit” courses, it is necessary to use not only the material and technical base but also the scientific and pedagogical personnel of the university in which these courses are opened (SARF, n.d. pp. 6-9).

A. F. Evstigneeva-Belyakov was considered in the resolution of the People’s Commissariat of Education on Higher Pedagogical Courses, adopted in April 1924, which legally fixed the purpose, content, and specifics of educational and production activities of the “retrofit” courses.

S. Ya. Kupidonov (1928) argued that preparation for pedagogical courses should include pedagogical and special industrial practices. This scientist and teacher was the first to substantiate the requirement that it is mandatory to improve the pedagogical and production (engineering) component of the professional qualifications of engineer teachers.

M. M. Rubinstein and I. A. Kairov (Head of the Section of Agro-Pedagogical Education in the Department of Professional Pedagogy of the Research Institute of Scientific Pedagogy) in his works proposed the organization of two- and / or three-year interfaculty pedagogical departments and faculties discipline-specific universities as a promising form of training teachers of vocational education from among the senior students of the leading faculties of these universities. M. M. Rubinstein (1928) was convinced that the main advantage of this form of training teachers of vocational training (in comparison with short-term pedagogical courses) is that future teachers of special disciplines, studying at the interfaculty department (faculty), will have the opportunity to gradually study the disciplines of psychological and pedagogical, general methodical and particular methodical cycles. He also believed that for the functioning of interfaculty pedagogical departments and faculties at discipline-specific universities, it is necessary to create departments of pedagogy (methodology or psychology). The training of students who wanted to get a second specialty (pedagogical and engineering, agronomical, etc.) should be focused on these departments.

M. M. Rubinstein (1928) considered the content of special pedagogical training at interfaculty departments in a technical university as an example. He believed that it should include the following disciplines:

- Philosophy and methodology of technical sciences;
- Pedagogy and its history;
- Psychology;
- Physiology;
- Hygiene;
- History of technology.

Based on these training courses, general methodological disciplines and private methods should be carried out. The theory should be closely related to practice throughout the learning process. A student's transfer from course to course at the leading faculty should not depend on his progress in the interfaculty department. However, the pedagogical department can transfer a student from one stage of study to another, only considering the student's implementation of the curriculum at the leading faculty.

A. F. Evstigneev-Belyakov proposed a similar form of training for special pedagogical personnel for professional educational institutions – with the restoration of four- or five-year terms of higher education studies. A. F. Evstigneev-Belyakov called it “teaching” special (technical, agricultural, socio-economic, medical and art) universities by organizing pedagogical departments in them. The scientist believed that such training should organically combine the psychological, pedagogical, and production components, and “the teaching of an engineer, agronomist, bookkeeper, commodity expert should be carried out not abstractly, but in engineering, agronomic, etc. slope” (Evstigneev-Belyakov, 1927). Undoubtedly, this requirement is still relevant today for the remaining single departments and divisions that continue to train vocational training teachers in complicated and ambiguous conditions for vocational pedagogical education.

N. I. Barbashov, S. E. Gaisinovich, A. A. Krasnovsky et al put forward and substantiated in their works the idea of opening specialized (industrial, agricultural, etc.) pedagogical institutes and faculties with four- or five years of study as a promising and basic form of training special pedagogical personnel from among those who graduated from secondary school.

N. I. Barbashov argued that specialized universities should be organized in all specialties required by the industry and agriculture of the country. In the long term, it is these institutes, which combine psychological, pedagogical and special sectoral (professional/industrial) training of teachers of vocational training, intended to become “centers of organized training and retraining of pedagogical personnel, acquiring a network of courses and other modern types of institutions” (Barbashov, 1930; SARF, n.d. pp 61–63).

N. I. Barbashov and S. E. Gaisinovich defined the content of education in specialized universities only in general terms. A. A. Krasnovsky gave a rationale and a detailed description of the components of this training based on an analysis of the activities of the Industrial Pedagogical Institute named after K. Liebknecht (opened in 1928 for the preparation of teachers of special disciplines in the schools of factory apprenticeship and lower vocational schools). He believed that when establishing compulsory psychological and pedagogical disciplines for the study, one should proceed “from the needs, firstly, in methodological training in the specialty, secondly, in training in organizational and pedagogical terms, and, thirdly, finally, from the need in the fundamental historical-sociological and pedagogical foundations for methodological and organizational-pedagogical constructions” (Krasnovsky, 1929a). Like M. M. Rubinstein, the author argued that it is precisely the socio-philosophical and “disciplines of the production cycle” that should serve as the foundation of psychological and pedagogical training. Preparation involves the mastering by students of the following training courses:

- History of pedagogy;
- Pedology (including general psychology and physiology of a teenager);
- Theories of upbringing and education;
- School hygiene;
- Pedagogical psychology;
- School studies;
- Didactics of vocational education and methods of teaching special disciplines (Krasnovsky, 1929a).

The pedagogical practice of students must solve both organizational and educational and pedagogical problems. A. A. Krasnovsky proposed a wide range of types of students' independent work and analyzed the specifics of their graduation work aimed at researching theoretical issues of pedagogical science. In addition to theses, he analyzed graduation projects that involved developing one of the types of educational and production activities of a teacher in a professional educational institution.

We emphasize that the A. A. Krasnovsky, the principles of organization, and the content of training students in specialized institutes were only partially implemented in the 1930s. (Moscow industrial pedagogical and Novozybkov agro-pedagogical institutes). They were considered in full when organizing the Sverdlovsk, Kharkiv, and Volga engineering and pedagogical institutes in the late 1970s–1980s.

As an alternative to the forms of education considered above (I. F. Ankudinov, A. Ryndich, N. Shaposhnikov, P. N. Shimbirev, etc.) early 1930s, they proposed the “pedagogization” of industrial vocational educational institutions, first of all, universities as well as technical schools. The advancement and substantiation of the idea of pedagogization were preceded by the third session of the State Academic Council to expand the profiles of specialists trained in vocational educational institutions. These profiles included the requirement for compulsory mastering of “a minimum of teaching and methodological knowledge.”

Its supporters assessed supporters of “universal pedagogy” (Shimbirev, 1932) of technical, economic, agricultural, medical, art, and other professional educational institutions as a universal means for solving all problems caused by the shortage of vocational training teachers. Pedagogy was to be carried out by including short-term and small-volume courses of pedagogy and methodology (also called psychology) in the curricula of industry-specific vocational educational institutions (Shaposhnikov, 1931; Ryndich, 1933).

Some experts substantiated the need for more extensive and detailed training of future specialists in the “pedagogical and methodological” plan. I. F. Ankudinov (an employee of the Institute of Industrial Personnel of the People’s Commissariat of Heavy Industry) believed that for technical colleges, the “pedagogical” content of students’ education should include the study of theoretical disciplines (foundations of pedagogy, pedagogical and psychotechnical minimum, methods of teaching special disciplines). Besides, there should be two types of pedagogical practice: “school and pedagogical” and social and pedagogical, accompanying continuous production training.

A. Ryndich (1933) substantiated a completely different approach to the organization of pedagogy. He believed that the choice of one or another organizational form of pedagogization should depend on its addressee. For example, A. Ryndich suggested organizing pedagogical seminars for graduate students of industrial universities. Cycles of lectures on the basics of pedagogy and teaching methods are read to students of higher and secondary vocational educational institutions. He proposed to conduct pedagogical seminars for engineers and technicians already working as teachers in technical schools, vocational-technical schools, and factory schools. A. Ryndich believed that the possibility of obtaining pedagogical qualifications at the engineering and pedagogical faculty of the All-Union Correspondence Institute of Technical Education was promising.

*Instructor technical schools* were another organizational form of training special pedagogical personnel, discussed in the historical period under study by some teachers, such as I. Dashevsky, D. N. Evreinov, F. F. Korolyov. However, the training content and organizational specifics in these technical schools did not receive a severe and thorough study in the publications we found. In the years under consideration, we found that the training of instructors (foremen) was carried out only in one industrial instructor technical school in Moscow.

The work of D. N. Evreinov (1929) is of specific interest in connection with the problem of training special pedagogical personnel of the middle level. For the first time, the figure of the instructor leader was considered in this work, and the basic requirements for him were determined. The author believed that a new type of instructor should have the following qualities:

- Professional (industrial) qualifications of at least tenth grade and three years of production experience;
- General pedagogical and methodological training;
- Possess the knowledge and skills of the organizer.

F. F. Korolev (in 1928–33, a member of the Main Scientific Council), assessing the deplorable situation developed by the mid-1930s. with instructors, believed that the staff of industrial training instructors in vocational schools should be replenished by attracting skilled workers from production. He also spoke of “keeping the best graduates of vocational schools as instructors” (Korolev, 1934). These “instructors” must master the pedagogical minimum in absentia, including industrial training methodology basics. Speaking

about the prospects for training instructor personnel, the scientist-teacher substantiated the need for “further deepening their study so that the instructor could combine the work of a teacher of theoretical subjects. The combination of industrial and theoretical training with one teacher will give positive results” (Korolev, 1934). We emphasize that F. F. Korolyov on the training of a new type of teacher, capable of combining the functions of a teacher of special disciplines and a master of industrial training, was implemented only in the 1970s and 1990s at several educational institutions. These included the Sverdlovsk Engineering Pedagogical Institute (later names: Ural / Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University) and the Volga State Engineering Pedagogical Institute. Also, at some engineering (industrial) pedagogical faculties as part of individual technical, agricultural, and pedagogical universities and universities.

## DISCUSSION

In the 1920s–1930s, attempts to scientifically substantiate new organizational forms and content of training for special pedagogical personnel were of decisive importance for the formation and subsequent development of the system of vocational pedagogical education in our country, serving as its theoretical “foundation.” In particular, the training of teachers of vocational training and instructors masters of industrial training occurred and the institution of the Chief of the General Directorate of Vocational Education and the Technopedagogical Department in it.

The complexity and the relative novelty of the problem of “cadres for cadres” that arose in the 1920s and early 1930s for educated educators, educational administrators, and practicing teachers affected the individual components of the analyzed works. We acknowledge that not all of the opinions and judgments expressed can be recognized as unambiguously correct and indisputable. In particular, these include the negative assessment of the potential of specialized (engineering, agro-pedagogical) universities. P. N. Shimbirev and M. M. Rubinstein believed that with such training, the quality of both the pedagogical and production components of a specialist would suffer. A. A. Krasnovsky proposed “breeding” the training of teachers of special disciplines for various vocational educational institutions: for work in technical schools – in pedagogical courses (psychological and pedagogical posttraining), for work in factory apprenticeship schools, schools for peasant youth, etc.

## CONCLUSION

We established historical, logical, and comparative analysis of archival materials and pedagogical publications of the period 1920 – early 1930. the following:

- Some Russian scientists, managers, and practicing teachers in those years proposed, discussed, and developed (including Russian prerevolutionary and foreign experience) several options for organizing the training of special pedagogical personnel:
- One- and two-year pedagogical courses, both independently existing (“institution” courses), and “retrofit” courses – for people with higher professional (technical, agricultural, economic, art, etc.) education (A. F. Evstigneev-Belyakov, M. M. Rubinstein, S. Ya. Kupidonov, I. A. Kairov, A. A. Krasnovsky, and others);
- Two- or three-year additional interfaculty pedagogical departments and faculties in industrial universities – for students of the third (fourth) course (M. M. Rubinshtein, I. A. Kairov, A. F. Evstigneev-Belyakov);
- Specialized (industrial-pedagogical, engineering-pedagogical, agro-pedagogical, etc.) institutes and faculties with a 4–5-year term of study - for persons with secondary education (N. I. Barbashov, S. E. Gaisinovich, A. A. Krasnovsky);
- Pedagogization of professional educational institutions including technical, economic, agricultural, medical, art and other industrial universities and technical schools of psychological and pedagogical disciplines in the curricula (I. F. Ankudinov, N. Shaposhnikov, P. N. Shimbirev, A. Ryndich, etc.);

- Instructor technical schools for those who graduated from an incomplete secondary and even (at some stages) primary school, factory apprenticeship schools, and schools for peasant youth (D. N. Evreinov, F. F. Korolev, I. Dashevsky, etc.);
- Some of these scientists were categorical in their choice of one or another form of training vocational education teachers and rejected any other training options. Others admitted the possibility of “coexistence” of several (basic and additional) forms of training;
- Most of the authors of the works studied by us made attempts to determine the main content and organizational principles of training special pedagogical personnel (within the framework of the proposed organizational forms of their training). They established the basic requirements for the level of scientific, theoretical, and industrial qualifications of vocational education teachers. A strict requirement for every teacher of special and general technical disciplines and an instructor (master) of industrial training in a vocational school of any level, a condition for the quality of their professional activity, was recognized as the obligatory psychological and pedagogical training;
- Despite the ambiguity of some judgments, individual inaccuracies, and even mistakes made when substantiating certain provisions by the authors of the studies studied, we recognize that, in general, their works were a scientific and theoretical basis for not only the formation of a system of vocational pedagogical education in 1920–1930s, but also its subsequent development in 1940–1990s (Dorozhkin & Zeer, 2014).

We recognize that in the last 10–15 years, vocational pedagogical education as a relatively independent branch in the Russian education system has been practically destroyed. There are only “parts” of vocational pedagogical education left: departments and departments that train vocational education teachers (Verbitskaya, Romantsev & Fedorov, 2008).

We believe that vocational and pedagogical education as a system of targeted training of “cadres for cadres” should be revived in new socio-economic conditions. And then (very soon), some of the theoretical concepts established as a result of our research that determine the possible options for organizational forms and content of training professional pedagogical personnel will again become relevant. After all, any development follows a spiral, and no one has canceled the laws of dialectics, including the “transition of quantitative changes to qualitative” and “negation of negation.”

## REFERENCES

- Ankudinov, I.F. (1932). Let us equip engineers and technicians with the foundations of Marxist-Leninist pedagogy. *For Industrial Personnel*, 3–4, 57–60.
- Dorozhkin, E.M., & Zeer, E.F. (2014). The methodology of vocational pedagogical education: Theory and practice (meaning-making provisions for integrating vocational pedagogical education). *Prosveshchenie i Nauka*, 10(119), 8–30.
- Evreinov, D.N. (1929). Production of skilled labor in transport. *Prosveshchenie na Transporte*, 7, 78–81.
- Evstigneev-Belyakov, A.F. (1927). On the issue of training teachers of special disciplines for educational institutions of the General Directorate of Vocational Education. *Narodnoe Prosveshchenie*, 8–9, 104–111.
- Kairov, I.A. (1930). *On the training of specialist teachers for secondary and lower vocational educational institutions*. Collection of articles. On the training of teaching staff. Moscow, RSFSR: Rabotnik prosveshcheniya.
- Korolev, F.F. (1934). The qualification upgrading of instructors. *Kadry Zheleznodorozhnogo Transporta*, 7, 59–60.
- Krasnovsky, A.A. (1929a). On the training of teaching staff for secondary vocational schools. *Narodnoe Prosveshchenie*, 12, 28.
- Krasnovsky, A.A. (1929b). On the issue of the reform of higher pedagogical educational institutions. *Nauchnyj Rabotnik*, 1, 52–62.

- Kupidonov, S.Ya. (1928). Production and pedagogy in the pedagogical activity of an engineer. Engineer-teacher. *Collection of Articles*, pp. 43–52. Moscow, USSR: Higher pedagogical courses at the Moscow Higher Technical School.
- RSFSR People's Commissariat of Education. (1930). On industrial pedagogical universities on the training of pedagogical personnel. Resolution on the report of N. I. Barbashov. In *Resolutions of the II session of the State Academic Council of the RSFSR People's Commissariat of Education* (pp. 33–35). Moscow, USSR: Rabotnik prosveshcheniya.
- Rubinstein, M.M. (1928). *Engineer-teacher*. Moscow, USSR: Higher pedagogical courses at the Moscow Higher Technical School.
- Ryndich, A. (1933). Pedagogical staff. *Za Promyshlennye Kadry*, 9, 50–53.
- SARF. Fund 298, Inventory 1, Storage unit 8, pp. 21–24, 61–63.
- Shaposhnikov, N. (1931). The problem of pedagogy. *Za Kachestvo Kadrov*, 9, 34.
- Shimbirev, P.N. (1932). The system of public education in the 2nd five-year plan. *Kommunisticheskoe Prosveshchenie*, 8, 64–73.
- State Archives of the Russian Federation (SARF). (n.d.). Fund 1565, Inventory 1, Storage unit 665, Pages 6–9.
- Tenchurina, L.Z. (2000). *Training and professional development of professional-pedagogical personnel in Russia (1920-1990)*. Moscow, Russia: Higher School.
- Verbitskaya, N.O., Romantsev, G.M., & Fedorov, V.A. (2008). The hidden personnel problem of the innovative Russian economy: The potential of the system of professional and pedagogical education. *Education and Science*, 5(53), 84–90.