

**N. O. Fedchyshyn**

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0909-4424>

Scopus Author ID 57202833382

**H. I. Klishch**

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1074-1772>

Scopus Author ID 57202834170

**S. I. Hnatyshyn**

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0021-0879>

Scopus Author ID 57430481100

*I. Horbachevsky Ternopil National Medical University*

## TEACHER TRAINING: MODEL OF HERBARTINIANISM

**Н. О. Федчишин, Г. І. Кліщ, С. І. Гнатишин**

*Тернопільський національний медичний університет імені І. Я. Горбачевського МОЗ України*

## ПІДГОТОВКА ВЧИТЕЛЯ: МОДЕЛЬ ГЕРБАРТІАНСТВА

**Abstract.** The article analyzes Herbartians pedagogy and the activities of educational institutions in the light of Herbartianism; retraces the main factors of training teachers of relevant qualifications at higher educational institutions, design and development of curricula and textbooks in pedagogy, publication of research results of pedagogues-Herbartians' research work in scientific journals; points out the Herbartians' traditions in the symbiotic training of a teacher run both by the state and by the church.

The central idea of Herbartianism was the conviction that the purpose of education was the development of "ethical character". Herbartianism pedagogy was never a monolith pedagogic theory, and the attitude to Herbartianism, criticised for schematism, formalism and dogmatism, has always been ambiguous. Different schools within Herbartianism had strong disagreements, which were hearkened back to different attitudes towards Herbart and his theory.

**Key words:** Herbartians pedagogy; teacher training; teacher education; pedagogues-Herbartians' activity; theory and practice.

**Анотація.** У статті висвітлюються основні аспекти гербартіанської педагогіки щодо діяльності навчальних закладів; простежено основні чинники підготовки вчителя відповідної кваліфікації у педагогічних семінаріях, проаналізовано проектування та розробку навчальних програм і підручників з педагогіки, результати досліджень педагогів-гербартівців у наукових виданнях; вказано на гербартіанські традиції, тобто симбіоз держави та церкви у підготовці вчителя; з'ясовано основні шляхи досягнення педагогічної майстерності з опорою на власну практику.

Педагогіка гербартіанства ніколи не була монолітною педагогічною теорією, і ставлення до гербартіанства, критикованого за схематизм, формалізм і догматизм, завжди було неоднозначним. Різні школи всередині гербартіанської течії мали розбіжності, першопричиною яких було різне ставлення до Гербарта та його теорії.

**Ключові слова:** гербартіанська педагогіка; підготовка вчителя; педагогічна освіта; діяльність педагогів-гербартіанців; теорія і практика.

**Introduction.** Establishing the continuum of similar and common requirements for an educational system, identifying the scope of similarity in theory and practice, defining the content and key vectors of general trends in the development of education, analyzing the current state of educational system in Ukraine and integrational processes of the formation of a common educational space in Europe according to their conceptual parameters indicate the need in a thorough study and generalization of European pedagogical

experience of the past. In this context, the development of the domestic concept of high-quality education is largely guided by the educational achievements of European states. Germany, undoubtedly, belongs to the leading countries with the long-standing traditions in educational area. The professional training of teachers, who have profound knowledge in pedagogy, psychology, ethics, methodology, cultural studies, and use interactive methods, is a priority of educational development in Germany. The implementation of modern educational concepts is based, in a great measure, on the national and global achievements of

the past, which require careful study and thorough research. In view of this our attention is drawn to the prognostic, profound and practical considerations of J. F. Herbart and his successors about high-quality training of future teachers. Such famous foreign scholars as E. Adam, D. Benner, W. Brezinka, E. Winter, J. Hopfner, F. Hörburger, H. Grimm, M. Johnston, Klatenhof, W. Klingberg, R. Coriand, R. Körenz, P. Metz, J. Ölkens, K. Prange, P. Stachel and others explored the above mentioned issue. Since the 1990s the pedagogy of J. F. Herbart and the Herbartians has become the object of a considerable renewed interest, particularly in Germany and Austria. From this perspective, the conferences conducted in Oldenburg in 1991, 1994 and 1996 were significant. In 1997 the international conference “Herbartianism: the Forgotten History of a Science” (“Der Herbartianismus: die vergessene Wissenschaftsgeschichte”) was arranged in Jena (the center of German Herbartianism). Later similar conferences were held in Sint-Niklaas, Belgium (2005), Halle, Germany (2007), Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Switzerland (2009), Warsaw, Poland (2011), Essen, Germany (2013, 2015) and Paris, France (2017), Jena, Germany (2019), Budapest, Hungary (2022), Graz, Austria (2023).

**The aim** – to explore the importance of teacher training in context of the model of Herbartianism in education institutions.

**Theoretical framework.** The most remarkable was the disagreement between K. V. Stoy and T. Ziller. The Herbartians never agreed completely among themselves about their pedagogical views, but they were united in the idea of raising pedagogy to the rank of academic science.

According to some researchers, Herbart was the first to make an important attempt to form teacher's scientific and pedagogical outlook and develop a philosophy of teaching. According to W. Brezinka, J. F. Herbart was popular among the secondary school teachers, because the whole system of German secondary education of that time was based on his pedagogy [5, p. 413].

German educator, philosopher, psychologist and university professor J. F. Herbart contributed to the reform of educational and teaching practice, analyzed the problem of high-quality teacher training in a historical aspect, and revolutionized educational thinking. He has been recognized as the founder of scientific pedagogics, pedagogical theory and practice. Herbart's thinking, experimentation and personal experience as a teacher and educator helped him to form his theory of education which was founded on practical knowledge and philosophical reflection.

It is thanks to J. F. Herbart the notion of “pedagogical tact” has become a common heritage of pedagogical thinking and activity. In his work “Pedagogical Writings” (“Pädagogische Schriften”) (1802) it was highlighted that the pedagogical tact was formed in the process of pedagogical practice. According to Herbart, a teacher should be acquainted with pupils' mental development, to use what a pupil already knows [12]. The scientist and his successors stressed that success or failure of all pedagogical efforts depended on how the teacher “formed” his tact through thinking and reflection, research and science.

Herbart's scientific views have influenced mainly pedagogical practice. The undeniable proof of this was the practical school, he founded for the students of preparatory courses in Königsberg in 1808, where he delivered lectures on pedagogy and conducted discussions on the topics proposed by the students. In particular, Herbart wrote to the curator at the University of Königsberg: “If I worked every day for an hour with a small number of students familiar with my pedagogy, soon under my guidance they would be able to impart their knowledge to new students” [8, p. 106]. His proposal was supported. The King of Prussia, Friedrich Wilhelm III, demanded profound reforms in the system of education. F. Nikolovius and J. W. Süvern offered an urgent “renovation” of educational institutions (universities and gymnasias). They drew attention to Herbart's considerations on this subject in his “Sketch of the Foundation of a Pedagogical Seminary” (“Entwurf zur Anlegung eines pädagogischen Seminars”) (1809) [12]. In this, the so-called “institute of didactics”, a trainee teacher worked with 2-3 students for 4-5 hours per week. As it was emphasized by Herbart, it was a unique opportunity to introduce new teaching methods, apply them in practice, and present the achievements of pedagogical experience. He also noticed the fact that the last had to be recognized in scientific circles as completed and grounded [8].

One of Herbart's successors was K. V. Stoy (1815–1885), who divided pedagogy into three relatively independent branches – philosophical (the purpose and means of teaching and education), practical (the organization of education in family and school) and historical (the development of theory and practice of teaching and education). From Herbart he acquired the belief that practice was an important part of pedagogy, and that theory had to be combined with practice. K. Stoy was conservative in his interpretation of Herbart's ideas [15].

After Herbart's death, K. V. Stoy on December 9, 1842 opened a pedagogical seminary in Jena, similar to the one Herbart had established at Königsberg. At the seminary studied students of both sexes (from 1844), which was not practiced before. In 1844 the Herbartian opened there a practice school (2 classes for girls). Since 1848 at the pedagogical seminary children of the lower social strata have studied, and Stoy made all efforts to increase the number of such classes. The practice school numbered about 170 students and became a model for the establishment of the pedagogical seminary at Leipzig University. 1876 was the year of integration of the pedagogical seminary and the Johann-Friedrich School (Johann-Friedrichs-Schule).

The number of the practicing teachers has increased from 4 to 12 in the first year of its existence. At that time, the number of students willing to study at the seminary school was growing [13, p. 35]. In addition to the homeroom teachers, full-time and part-time trainee teachers worked with the students. The full-time teachers before working at the seminary had to undergo a probationary period at the seminary school. There were three classes and, accordingly, three homeroom teachers, who trained them for classes, and reported to the school principal. Beginners could start teaching there only after attending classes in their subject. As O. Beyer noted, the duties of the homeroom teachers were performed by two trainee teachers. The training material was prepared at the request of the school principal and supervising teacher in a written form and it was subject to thorough check [3, p. 43]. The homeroom teachers were responsible for the educational work of the trainee teachers and had the right to attend their classes, make comments, and give instructions or useful advice. The educational material was divided according to the themes and number of classes, and besides, the prepared guiding questions were added. At the end of each week there was a conference of the seminary's trainee teachers, where they discussed classes and arrangements for organization of work and discipline.

All staff was required to attend weekly meetings at the seminary. After the conference the theoretical and pedagogical trainings were conducted twice a week. Their results were registered in "The Results of Practice". The meetings at the seminary included: theoretical analysis, workshop and conference. For the theoretical analysis the trainee teachers prepared mock lectures and essays on ethics, psychology, pedagogy and methodology. At the conference, the homeroom teacher appointed one reviewer for each trainee

teacher, who, according to the relevant scheme, presented his findings a day before the work began. In addition, the trainee teacher evaluated his own work. Based on both reports and answers to the questions raised during the discussion, the overall evaluation was made. The following points were brought up at the conference: 1) discussion of the practice: reading off self-critical and critical remarks, discussion, review; 2) analysis of theoretical works; 3) any other business.

The Stoy's pedagogical seminary in Jena has graduated over 600 students. Theological students received there practical and pedagogical education, which combined the following forms: pedagogy, practice, reviewing and scholasticism. *Pedagogy* in the form of lectures served to theoretical and pedagogical training. Seminarians or K. Stoy by himself prepared the reports on the publications and textbooks in pedagogy, discussed special psychological and pedagogical issues, and presented original curricula for the school at the seminary, where they gained pedagogical experience. *Practice* included mock classes (the presence of all seminarians and their supervisor was obligatory). Practical classes were thoroughly discussed at the *reviewing* by the seminarians, reviewer and head of the seminary, and got Stoy's general evaluation. The extra curricular school time was the subject of *scholasticism*. The internal code of conduct at the school envisaged an "authority responsible for everything at school, except for the didactics and methodology – scholasticism (weekly news, issues, instructions, suggestions, etc., including moral behavior, cleanness and discipline)" [15]. The forms and methods of teaching at the seminary were aimed, first of all, at the proper training of future teachers or educators [16, p. 124]. The seminarians spent most of their school life in hobby clubs, associations and societies (catechism, physical exercises, library, museums, excursions, music) [15].

K. V. Stoy tried to realize his theoretical views at the school he created at Jena seminary, where the advanced methods of teaching (excursions, dramatization, manual work, etc.) were used. Teaching at the practice school was assigned exclusively to the seminarians under the supervision of an experienced teacher and was carried out in accordance with the curriculum of folk schools. Stoy laid emphasis on illustrative teaching. He gave his instructions to the seminarians. In particular, they had to be knowledgeable in their subject area, art of teaching and pedagogical tact. The Herbartian was focused on the pupils' outlook. For example, exercises in the native language were educational, geography and

nature studies were taught on the basis of environmental observations etc. Stoy's indisputable achievement was his speeches in support of the school, where pupil's personality would be developed.

The German tradition of Herbartianism differentiates the Stoy and Ziller schools, the former remaining true to Herbart's ideas and the latter extending them. K. Stoy and T. Ziller have accelerated pedagogical processes of thinking and activities proposed by J. F. Herbart, so that at the beginning of their academic activity they offered and organized pedagogical seminars in the form of educational institutions, where were the opportunities to train young trainee teachers for their future educational work.

In 1870 K. Stoy published "Psychology in a Concise Presentation" ("Die Psychologie in gedrängter Darstellung") as a guide for conducting lectures and practical classes in gymnasia, pedagogical seminaries and universities. The foreword included speculations about the need for studying elements of psychology at higher educational institutions. K. Stoy stated that students had limited knowledge of the fundamentals of philosophy and demanded the introduction elements of logic and psychology into the educational process [9, p. 29]. In order to eliminate the "arbitrariness" of empiricism and materialism (abrogating the distinction between spiritual and physical) from psychology, he followed three provisions of metaphysics when teaching general psychology: 1) the only real medium has laid the foundations of all psychic phenomena; 2) one can observe the internal state of soul, but do not try to change it; 3) the simultaneous emergence of mental states returns to the motive of connection and interaction, present in soul.

Herbart's successor claimed that a university had the opportunity to introduce new pedagogical generations into science, so that they received the vision of educational problems, actively worked for the national education, and could better understand the problems of the younger generation. Those three requirements were noted by the Herbartian at the pedagogical seminary of Jena University.

W. Rein studied theology in Jena, also listening to Stoy's lectures on pedagogy. He succeeded Stoy at Jena and made it the center of Herbartian theory and practice that attracted students from other countries.

In Rein's pedagogy the pupil's personality was dominant. W. Rein focused on the importance of transferring knowledge from "generation to generation, from soul to soul and from personality to personality" [14, p. 73]. In such a manner he described the "spe-

cial" teacher training: 1) gained knowledge must be carefully checked and organized; accordingly, the educational material must be associated with the previous one, which would promote integrity and perfection; 2) when looking for the psychological preconditions of the educational process, a pupil should be the focus of attention (doing so scientifically grounded psychological and pedagogical tasks could be solved); 3) the main thing for a teacher was to be engaged in theory and practice, observe, find and develop new material, practice in his specialization, and be able to draw conclusions. The Herbartian emphasized that a teacher must be an artist and an actor and must possess moral quality. In particular, he stressed that "not only scientifically grounded knowledge is the most important in pedagogy, but also "artistic" work, its direct influence on the hearts of young people" [14].

Concerning the relation between theory and practice, the Herbartians proceeded from the fact that practicing teachers, because of their ignorance in scientific explanations, drew more on their own experience and observations. They convinced that this fact negatively impacted educational career of teachers as they acted at their own discretion. Herbart's successors supported their teacher's idea, that anyone studying art in activity and thinking in science determined his behavior by an experience [7, p. 19]. In their opinion, it was important that a teacher, before planning classes, kept in his mind a "picture of a pure soul", instead of saddling himself with in significant things. W. Rein, T. Ziller, F. W. Dörpfeld et al. considered unacceptable when teachers of higher educational establishments pursued science and did not apply their knowledge and scientific achievements to the needs of an average student. They emphasized that such situation could be avoided if teaching seminaries were established at universities, and academic staff worked on an equal basis with practicing teachers [7, p. 59].

F. W. Dörpfeld characterized W. Rein as a smart, quick-witted, kind-hearted teacher and well-known practicing educator of that time. In 1885 Rein headed the Department of Pedagogy in Jena and with the Minister of Culture Weimer's permission founded the folk school at the pedagogical seminary (three classes for the primary, secondary and higher levels). His lectures on general pedagogy were based primarily on two subjects: ethics and philosophy. Besides, he introduced additional lectures: "Life and Doctrine of J. F. Herbart" ("Herbarts Leben und Lehre"), "Problems of Modern Pedagogy" ("Probleme der modernen Pädagogik"), and "School Education



Abroad” (“Ausländisches Schulwesen”). Under Rein’s supervision in 1895–1900 the seven-volume work (first edition), and later the ten-volume work (second edition) of the “Encyclopedic Handbook of Pedagogy” (“Enzyklopädisches Handbuch der Pädagogik”) were published [1, p. 38].

W. Rein considered pedagogy as an applied science similarly to medicine. If the latter was based on knowledge of anatomy and physiology, the former relied, on his conviction, on ethics and psychology. He enunciated his thoughts in “The Theory and Practice” (“Theorie und Praxis”), published in the “Encyclopedic Handbook of Pedagogy”, where thoroughly explained the problems of theory and practice. Differences between theory and practice he saw in the under-estimation of theory as opposed to practice. Over estimation of practice he found in exaggerating the role of experience [6, p. 149]. Pedagogical science was for Rein nothing else but systematized, well-ordered, substantiated embodiment of the “pure” experience gained and tested by people through education. The educator understood that practice was the beginning of pedagogical science, and it played a leading role. He explained, that it was possible to achieve progress, only when a practitioner was aware of his own weaknesses and took interested in the experience and results of other teachers. W. Rein insisted, that it would be possible to reach a higher scientific level, when bring into the system of indisputable concepts the combination of the results of thoughts and actions with continuous practice, and then theory would precede practice. Although theory indicated only the direction, both of them were intertwining with each other. Rein emphasized that in such interpenetration, the “naked” practice was “blind, uncertain progress”, in which there was no clarity of theoretical knowledge [14, p. 54].

W. Rein appealed to organize and equip educational institutions for the scientific pedagogy with the purpose of their influence on gymnasias, pedagogical seminaries and other educational institutions [17, p. 408]. Training at the seminary school was based on constant concentration of attention, on the results of synthesis and systemacity. Leipzig Pedagogical Seminary was closed in 1882 after Ziller’s death, but the seminary in Jena continued to train specialists.

W. Rein in his work “Pedagogy in a Systemic Presentation” (“Pädagogik in systematischer Darlegung”) outlined the importance of thorough high-quality teacher training, since it determined the further education of people, formed moral qualities which, in his opinion, was one of the main elements for national

education. The Herbartian opposed the based opinion of the representatives of higher educational institutions that a teacher should be, first of all, a scientist. He emphasized the importance of symbiosis of a good scientist and “smart” practicing teacher. Actually, the primary task of a pedagogical seminary W. Rein saw in the further development of pedagogical science and high-quality theoretical and practical teacher training. Such twin challenge, in his opinion, could not be resolved neither by the state nor by another private institution, but only by the university, where practical philosophy was focused on the issues of the meaning and purpose of life, and empirical psychology tried to disclose the laws of spiritual and mental life, while psychology revealed new ways of physical health.

The tasks of pedagogical seminaries at universities the Herbartian saw in the further development of pedagogical science and theoretical and practical education of teachers. Both tasks, in his opinion, were interconnected. Both state and private schools made efforts to educate the younger generation, so it did not matter to him if they relied on university education, where practical philosophy dominated, and empirical psychology tried to reveal the laws of the soul of individuum.

That, according to W. Rein, was the opportunity to prepare the younger generation of teachers for scientific work and lay the foundations for practical work. He confirmed that the pedagogical seminary at Jena University fulfilled those tasks. W. Rein studied under the disciples of the German philosopher J. F. Herbart, K. V. Stoy and T. Ziller, and later tried independently, as a full-time professor of pedagogy in Jena, to solve the problem of high-quality teacher training in Germany. He emphasized the artistic and eclectic component of a pedagogical profession and demanded general professional-scientific, aesthetically-oriented training of teachers.

Herbartian pedagogy (from J. F. Herbart to T. Ziller, W. Rein and O. Willmann) became comprehensible and popular among German teachers. Herbart’s successors concluded that it contained methods, provisions, skills and instructions for achieving the goal and, moreover, was very dynamic. The Herbartians, together with their teacher, convinced that only activity could help to learn art and train a genuine specialist [1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 19].

T. Ziller investigated educational questions, and his first works extended Herbart’s ideas. He established a pedagogical seminary and practice school at the University of Leipzig. Ziller founded Society for Scientific Pedagogy (*Verein für wissenschaftliche*

*Pädagogik*) in 1868, which propagated Herbartian ideas, and studied Herbartian approaches to educational problems. Ziller was a strong supporter of Herbart's emphasis on the moral aspect of education, and tried to show how every part of instruction could contribute to the forming of character. He wrote "Basis of the Doctrine of Instruction as a Moral Force" ("Grundlegung zur Lehre vom erziehenden Unterricht"), published in 1865, which set forth Herbart's idea of instruction as a moral force.

T. Ziller paid special attention to the didactic training of teachers. He, in particular, stressed the importance of attaining pedagogical excellence through the "pedagogical tact". The Herbartian noted that one could achieve it only through practice, but using the instructions and methods of theory [18, p. 74].

T. Ziller appealed to his contemporaries for improving the quality of a school, teaching and training of future teachers: "Without a teacher there is no school, without improving its quality there is no improvement in education" [17, p. 615]. One of the main requirements to gain qualification of teacher was the organization of pedagogical schools based on scientific foundation at higher educational establishments.

Educational reforms in Germany and Austria-Hungary in the second half of the nineteenth century coincided with the impetus for the development of pedagogy as a science at universities. On the implementation of the Education Act § 42 dated 14 May 1869 it was provided the establishment of pedagogical seminaries at universities and technical institutes with the adscript "for better training of teaching staff". Educational political environments invited O. Willmann to discuss reformational changes. In accordance with the above mentioned Education Act, the Vienna City Council decided to open a normal school.

In 1868 Willmann received Austrian citizenship and was appointed the head of the department and senior teacher of the newly established normal school with the practice school. High-level officials and employees of the educational sector had a misconception about such school and considered its existence disputable and even dangerous. In disregard of biased attitude, O. Willmann managed to organize the practice school following T. Ziller's pedagogical reforms. The school quickly earned reputation, and in 1871/1872 there studied 230 students. The Herbartian himself had 21 lessons per week and conducted educational practice [5, p. 424].

While working at the normal school Willmann took an active part in discussions on theoretical and

practical training of teachers. In the article "On the Training of Teachers and Teacher Training Institutions" ("Über Lehrerbildung und Lehrerbildungsanstalten") (1869), the educator expressed an opinion about the functioning of practice schools and spoke against "a large number of demonstrative schools" [6, p. 153] at teacher training institutions. He demanded to found an institution that would control pedagogical activity. O. Willmann approved interconnected education, and criticism and notation at the conference discussions were useful in further training and practice.

According to the Commission results, the Department of Pedagogy was established at the University of Vienna. The Department was headed by T. Vogt. At the same time, the establishment of the Philosophy Departments at the universities of Graz and Innsbruck was approved. Their heads were obliged to deliver lectures on pedagogy. After that decision O. Willmann was asked to comment on the concept of pedagogical schools at universities in the presence of the Ministry of Education. The Herbartian highlighted the discrepancy: pedagogical practice referred to education and training, but the very science of education and training had "justified" difficulties. O. Willmann represented the thesis that "the introductory course on pedagogy at higher educational establishments is an essential condition for improving the quality of school education" [4]. His sketch assigned a specific meaning to lectures on general pedagogy, didactics and methodology, as well as history of education. He was convinced, that practice schools were basic for the high-quality training of future teachers.

After O. Willmann moved to the University of Prague, the Ministry of Education addressed him with a request to submit a proposal for the implementation of the Education Act § 42. Willmann presented a petition about "Pedagogical Seminaries at Universities", noting that "the resolution about the necessity of organization of special teacher courses (pedagogical seminaries) at universities or technical institutes for the general training of teachers is vague and controversial". In his opinion, it had three practical consequences: 1) it was possible to open advanced training courses for teachers of folk and city schools; 2) for the professional training of teachers, it was decided to organize, in accordance with the Education Act, teacher seminaries at universities, which must be available for the teachers of folk and city schools; 3) the resolution recommended to unite the two above-mentioned moments.

The first interpretation of the Education Act was not subject to discussion for O. Willmann, since it

completely excluded the organization of pedagogical seminars. In addition, the organization of advanced training courses at universities was undecided, since it was not clear how to admit the teachers of folk schools to universities. Willmann considered that it would only be a further theoretical education, and practice schools had to be integrated into the advanced training courses. According to the Education Act “Cooperation in the Teachers Training” (§ 35), “Participation in the Pedagogical Council” (§ 19), “Activities of School Inspectors” (§ 28), practical training was obligatory to train a highly educated teacher [17].

Another interpretation was found to conform to the Education Act. Willmann saw two options to establish theoretical and pedagogical seminary. The first – for the theoretical and pedagogical training (Royal Pedagogical Seminary in Leipzig, Thaulow Seminary in Kiel, Schwarz Seminary in Heidelberg). The second – with theoretical and practical training at educational institutions and practice schools (Stoy Seminary in Jena, Ziller University Seminary in Leipzig). O. Willmann explained why he did not support theoretically oriented seminars. In his arguments we follow the concerns about lowering the “level of theoretical study of educational science, when the teachers of folk schools will be admitted to such seminars”. It was his belief that teachers of folk schools would receive an “incomplete education” because they did not have gymnasium training. As evidence of his arguments, O. Willmann gave an example of the unsuccessful attempt to enroll the teachers of the folk school at the Royal Seminary, which led to the division into the pedagogical-philological and pedagogical sections, and the latter was not recognized even under the prudent guidance of H. Masius [6].

The third interpretation, that is, the combination of advanced training courses and pedagogical seminars was Willmann’s goal. He recommended organizing pedagogical seminars at universities together with practice schools. In this regard, he submitted to the Ministry of Education his sketch (16 paragraphs) of the Annex to the Education Act § 42. O. Willmann could not translate into practice formulated requirements for the organization of teaching seminars at universities at the newly founded (1876) seminary of Prague University. From the report on his teaching activities (1872–1875) it became clear what weight he lent to the lectures on general and philosophical pedagogy, didactics, history of pedagogy and theory of education, since he believed that pedagogy must take its place among other sciences [17]. The organization of

practical classes where lecture material was explained and discussed was problematic for O. Willmann. Large volume of tasks was difficult for the listeners, unprepared for such training [17]. The Herbartian tried to establish a connection and correspondence between the educational institutions, and prepared a statute with certain requirements. His beliefs envisaged the foundation of an institution that would be analogous to similar professional seminaries, namely, in accordance with § 1, the purpose of a pedagogical seminary was to enable students to master the basics of scientific pedagogy independentland their ability to work at an educational institution” [8].

An inquiry about the functioning of the pedagogical seminary at the university (1871) was of great significance for Willmann's reputation at the University of Prague. The Commission members: scientists (Miklos, Vogt, Stoy, Ziller, Masius and Zimmermann) and representatives of various non-governmental organizations (Ministerial Adviser Ficker, a headmaster of the gymnasium Hohegger and a headmaster of the college Diettes) raised three questions. 1. Was teacher training for secondary schools and functioning of pedagogical seminars at universities necessary or desirable? 2. Was it possible for a folk school teacher to receive in such seminaries a complete education and high-quality training? 3. What requirements to the educational material should be made at such seminaries? [5].

In Vogt’s conclusions we note the answer to the first question with disagreements, since the Commission members had different ideas about the need for the functioning of pedagogical seminars at universities. The teachers of folk schools were denied practice and internships at university seminaries. As to the third question, Miklos’s proposal, in which he demanded not to restrict the number of listeners to the lectures on pedagogy, while the number of students at a pedagogical seminary did not exceed 12, was supported. The Commission members were unanimous in the matter of the selection of educational materials by a lecturer [7, p. 67].

In his publications O. Willmann developed the idea of practice schools at seminaries. In the analysis of “Education for Teachers in Germany and Austria” he chronologically analyzed the need for education for teachers in: 1. pedagogical institutions (other than universities); 2. scientific seminaries; 3. pedagogical seminaries with practice schools; 4. pedagogical seminaries without practice schools [17]. After evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of the four types of educational institutions Willmann expressed an opinion: “One who can work in a team, has his own

opinion, and combines components of educational material into a single whole can study here” [7]. He understood arguments of the opponents of practice schools, but he was interested how the young teacher-theorist would teach and educate without practical skills? One of Willmann's answers was as follows: “Only primary (basic) education is fundamental for a young teacher; he is undergoing adaptation, learns to adapt the educational material and his mistakes are visible here” [17]. He supported this form of training from the didactic perspectives of higher education, since he believed that students receiving university education, would subsequently receive pedagogical competence and be good professionals.

The Herbartian contemplated that the students of pedagogical seminaries with practice schools at universities worked in “laboratory conditions”, so they received “genuine education”. Besides he criticized didacticians, who during the classes did not propose discussions about forms and methods of teaching the basic subjects, and means and methods of specialist formation. O. Willmann marked the strengths of Prague seminary, the seminary without practice school. The solution of the problem of training teachers for vocational and higher education was connected, according to O. Willmann, with the development of the science of education. The educational process at a university had to be organized according to the general didactic rules. At the same time, he assumed that there were objections to the study of the didactics of high school.

#### List of literature

1. Anhalt E. In welche Zukunft schaut die Pädagogik? Herbart's Systemgedanke heute / E. Anhalt. – Verlag IKS Garamond, 2009. – 177 S.
2. Benner D. Erziehung und Bildung! Zur Konzeptualisierung eines erziehenden Unterrichts, der bildet / D. Benner // Zeitschrift für Pädagogik. – 2015. – Vol. 61 (4). – S. 481–496.
3. Beyer O.-W. Zur Geschichte des Zillerschen Seminars / O.-W. Beyer. – Langensalza : H. Beyer & Söhne, 1897. – 147 S.
4. Bolle B. Das Lernberatungsgespräch im bildungstheoretischen Blickwinkel / B. Bolle. – Münster, München [u.a.] : Waxmann, 2008. – 80 S.
5. Brezinka W. Die Geschichte des Faches Pädagogik an den österreichischen Universitäten von 1805 bis 1970 / W. Brezinka // Pädagogica Historica. International Journal of the History of Education. New Series. – Amsterdam : Universitaire Stichting van België Verl., 1995. – B. 2, vol. XXXI. – S. 407–444.
6. Brezinka W. Otto Willmann, der bedeutendste Pädagogiker des alten Österreich / W. Brezinka // Geschichte und Gegenwart. Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte, Gesellschaftsanalyse und politische Bildung. – 1997. – Vol. 16. – S. 147–166.
7. Coriand R. Der Herbartianismus – die vergessene Wissenschaftsgeschichte / R. Coriand, M. Winkler. – Weinheim : Deutscher Studien Verlag, 1998. – 290 S.
8. Echoes of the Herbartianism in Western Ukraine / N. Fedchyshyn, H. Klishch, T. Horpinich, N. Yelahina // Cultura. International Journal of Philosophy of Culture and Axiology. – 2018. – Vol. 15 (1). – P. 103–114.
9. Fedchyshyn N. Herbart and Herbartianism in European Pedagogy: History and Modernity / N. Fedchyshyn, E. Protner // Медична освіта. – 2020. – № 2 (87). – С. 26–32.
10. Fedchyshyn N. Herbartianism in the pedagogical Theory and Practice / N. Fedchyshyn, H. Klishch, N. Yelahina // Медична освіта. – 2017. – № 2 (74). – С. 89–95.

Especially attractive, according to Willmann, was the organization of a scientific pedagogical seminary, which would provide high-quality teacher training. He justified the integration of practice and pedagogical schools into the universities with the peculiarity of pedagogical training. Practical activities at seminary schools had to consolidate students and teachers, and the obligatory condition was the involvement of folk and city school teachers.

**Conclusions and Prospects for Research.** Thus, the Herbartian pedagogy, one of the features of which was to ensure a close relationship and interdependence of theory and practice of education, received its clear and detailed elaboration and became available to a wide range of German educators. The Herbartians have focused on the high-quality didactic teacher training, and from this position denoted the main features of an educated, well-trained teacher – “pedagogical interest”, “pedagogical ability to speculate” and “pedagogical tact”. Pedagogical art can be achieved with the help of didactic scholarly works, interaction of theory and practice and communication between teachers and pupils.

Works of J. F. Herbart and the Herbartians had a great influence in the nineteenth-century development of the science of education. Their activity was guided by the concept of educational teaching. These ideas were widely spread into hundreds of schools. Herbart's contribution to the progress of pedagogical thinking and to the reform of pedagogical action produced the best in today's educational thinking. Herbartianism still enjoys a strong vogue in educational circles.



11. Fedchyshyn N. Peculiarities of future teacher's training at the higher educational establishment / N. Fedchyshyn, N. Yelahina // *Медична освіта*. – 2020. – № 1 (86). – С. 11–15.
12. Herbart J. F. *Umriß pädagogischer Vorlesungen Beigef. Werk Rede bei Eröffnung der Vorlesungen über Pädagogik [u.a.]* / J. F. Herbart. – Besorgt von Josef Esterhues Ort Paderborn Verlag Schöningh, 1964.
13. Rein W. *Bildende Kunst und Schule. Eine Studie zur Innenseite der Schulreform* / W. Rein. – Langensalza : Hermann Beyer & Söhne Verlag, 1923. – 104 S.
14. Rein W. *Das erste Schuljahr: ein theoretisch-praktischer Lehrgang für Lehrer und Lehrerinnen sowie zum Gebrauch in Seminarien* / W. Rein. – Dresden : Bleyl & Kaemmerer, 1888. – 202 S.

### References

1. Anhalt, E. (2009). *In welche Zukunft schaut die Pädagogik? Herbarts Systemgedanke heute*. Garamond: Verlag IKS.
2. Benner, D. (2015). Erziehung und Bildung! Zur Konzeptualisierung eines erziehenden Unterrichts, derbildet. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 61(4), 481-496.
3. Beyer, O.-W. (1897). *Zur Geschichte des Zillerschen Seminars*. Langensalza: H. Beyer & Söhne.
4. Bolle, B. (2008). *Das Lernberatungsgespräch im bildungstheoretischen Blickwinkel*. Münster [u.a.]: Waxmann.
5. Brezinka, W. (1995). *Die Geschichte des Faches Pädagogik an den österreichischen Universitäten von 1805 bis 1970*. Amsterdam: Universitaire Stichting van België Verl.
6. Brezinka, W. (1997). Otto Willmann, der bedeutendste Pädagoge des alten Österreich. *Geschichte und Gegenwart. Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte, Gesellschaftsanalyse und politische Bildung*, 16, 147-166.
7. Coriand, R., & Winkler, M. (1998). *Der Herbartianismus – die vergessene Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag.
8. Fedchyshyn, N., Klishch, H., Horpinich, T., & Yelahina, N. (2018). Echoes of the Herbartianism in Western Ukraine. *Cultura. International Journal of Philosophy of Culture and Axiology*, 15(1), 103-114.
9. Fedchyshyn, N., & Protner, E. (2020). Herbart and Herbartianism in European Pedagogy: History and Modernity. *Medychna osvita – Medical Education*, 2(87), 26-32.
10. Fedchyshyn, N., Klishch, H., & Yelagina, N. (2017). Herbartianism in the pedagogical Theory and Practice. *Medychna osvita – Medical Education*, 2(74), 89-95.
11. Fedchyshyn, N.O., & Yelahina, N.I. (2020). Peculiarities of future teacher's training at the higher educational establishment. *Medychna osvita – Medical Education*, 1(86), 11-15.
12. Herbart, J.F. (1964). *Umriß pädagogischer Vorlesungen Beigef. Werk Rede bei Eröffnung der Vorlesungen über Pädagogik [u.a.]*. Besorgt von J. Esterhues. Paderborn: Verlag Schöningh.
13. Rein, W. (1923). *Bildende Kunst und Schule. Eine Studie zur Innenseite der Schulreform*. Langensalza Verlag.
14. Rein, W. (1888). *Das erste Schuljahr: ein theoretisch-praktischer Lehrgang für Lehrer und Lehrerinnen sowie zum Gebrauch in Seminarien*. Dresden: Bleyl & Kaemmerer.
15. Stoy, K.V. (1881). *Schulordnung für die Seminarschule zu Jena*. Jena: Druck von A. Neuenhahn.
16. Vincze, B. (2008). Die Wirkung des Herbartianismus in den Lehrwerken des 468 ungarischen Gymnasiums zur Jahrhundertwende. *J. Hopfner, A. Németh. Pädagogische und kulturelle Strömungen in der k. u. k. Monarchie*. (B. 2). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
17. Willmann, O. (1968). *Sämtliche Werke. Hrsg. von H. Bitterlich-Willmann. (Bd. 1. (1857–1868))*. Aalen: Scientia Verlag.
18. Ziller, T. (1901). *Einleitung in die allgemeine Pädagogik Verfasserang. von Tuisikon Ziller, Vorlesunden über Allgemeine Pädagogik*. Leipzig: Verlag Teubner.
19. Ziller, T. (1876). *Materialien zur speziellen Pädagogik*. Dresden: Bleyl & Dämmerer.

Received 06.10.2023.  
Recommended 10.10.2023.

E-mail address for correspondence: fedushunno@tdmu.edu.ua