Введение. Проблема повышения уровня преподавания в сфере общего и профессионального образования является одной из наиболее значимых в современной педагогике. В связи с этим современные дидакты внимательно изучают наследие своих выдающихся предшественников, – педагогов прошлого. К числу таких ученых, оставших неповторимый след в педагогической науке и практике, относится американская учительница Хелен Паркхерст (1886-1973). Статья написана в связи с 135-летием со дня рождения Х. Паркхерст.

Материалы и методы. Методы исследования – анализ историко-педагогической, методической и художественной литературы по теме исследования, биографический, исторический и сравнительный методы, аксиологический (ценностный) подход к исследованию методических инноваций Х. Паркхерст.

Результаты. Американская учительница-новатор Хелен Паркхерст, наряду с Марией Монтессори, нарушила монополию мужчин на право считаться крупным ученым в области педагогики. Ее педагогическая деятельность включала в себя стремление к постоянному профессиональному самосовершенствованию, поиску новых путей в решении встававших перед ней педагогических проблем. Ее главным методическим достижением стала разработка Дальтон-плана, в соответствии с которым она успешно перестроила работу в одной из американских школ. Методическая новация Паркхерст получила одобрение со стороны вначале педагогов США, а затем повсюду в мире. В СССР в 1920-1930-х гг. этот метод также активно использовался, правда, без особого успеха. Применение Дальтон-плана в советской школе нашло отражение в ряде произведений художественной литературы (М. Г. Розанов, Н. И. Кочин).

Заключение. Методические идеи Хелен Паркхерст в наши дни крайне востребованы и активно используются в современной образовательной практике многих стран мира, в том числе в России. В то же время их позитивный потенциал еще не вполне изучен и освоен, поэтому наследие Х. Паркхерст заслуживает дальнейшего внимательного исследования дидактами и историками педагогики.
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Helen Parkhurst: the first female reformer in the field of organization of education

Introduction. The problem of improving the level of teaching in the field of general and vocational education is one of the most significant in modern pedagogy. In this regard, modern didactics carefully study the legacy of their outstanding predecessors, – teachers of the past. Among such scientists who have left a unique mark in pedagogical science and practice is the American teacher Helen Parkhurst (1886-1973).

Materials and methods. Research methods, – analysis of historical and pedagogical, methodological and fiction literature on the research topic, biographical, historical and comparative methods, axiological (value) approach to the study of methodological innovations by H. Parkhurst.

Results. American teacher-innovator Helen Parkhurst, alongside with Maria Montessori, violated the monopoly of men on the right to be considered a major scientist in the field of pedagogy. Her pedagogical activity included the desire for constant professional self-improvement, the search for new ways to solve the pedagogical problems that confronted her. Her main methodological achievement was the development of the Dalton plan, according to which she successfully rebuilt the work in one of the American schools. The methodological innovation of Parkhurst was approved first by teachers in the USA, and then everywhere in the world. In the USSR in the 1920s and 1930s, this method was also actively used, although without much success. The application of the Dalton plan in the Soviet school was reflected in a number of works of fiction (M. G. Rozanov, N. I. Kochin).

Conclusion. Helen Parkhurst’s methodological ideas are in great demand today and are actively used in modern educational practice in many countries of the world, including Russia. At the same time, their positive potential has not yet been fully explored and mastered, so the legacy of H. Parkhurst deserves further careful study by didactics and historians of pedagogy.
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The urgency of the problem

The need to improve the efficiency of the learning process in the field of general and vocational education is currently one of the most significant tasks of modern pedagogy. Domestic and foreign teachers conduct an intensive scientific search in a wide variety of research areas, in particular, in determining the role of the school in the development of human potential [1], in the search for new and more effective pedagogical management tools [2], in the use of traditional teaching methods, such as laboratory work [3], as well as the problem method and the use of film and video products as a teaching method [4]. Important attention in modern research is paid to the problem of forming a teacher's professional identity and various aspects of the development of school reform [5].

Traditionally, scientists of all branches of science are very interested in everything related to the introduction of the project method of teaching, both in the historical past of European and American education [6], and today, especially in the process of training engineers [7], specialists in the field of foreign languages [8; 9; 10] and even music [11]. The project approach is characterized as a kind of alternative to traditional approaches in teaching students and schoolchildren [12], as a means of developing organizational skills, and as a kind of organizational platform for conducting research of graduate students and outreach work on campus [13]. Also, domestic and foreign didactics carefully study the legacy of their outstanding predecessors, teachers of the past [14]. Of particular interest are the views of the most significant scientists, such as John Dewey [15; 16], Maria Montessori [17], Wilhelm Dilthey [18], Ellen Kay and Rudolf Steiner [19].

The American teacher Helen Parkhurst (1886-1973) is one of the scientists who left a unique legacy in pedagogical science and practice. The name of H. Parkhurst is well known to teachers all over the world, but unlike some of her contemporaries and compatriots, first of all, such as J. Dewey and W. H. Kilpatrick, incomparably fewer publications are devoted to her scientific achievements. Meanwhile, her idea of the Dalton Plan has become widespread in many countries, and up to nowadays continues to be one of the most discussed pedagogical phenomena. This article aims to reveal the essential aspects of the pedagogical heritage of H. Parkhurst, to show how it was used in our country in the 1920s and 1930s, to make some little-known facts of the biography of the remarkable teacher scientific property.

Materials and methods

The following research methods were used in the course of the study: analysis of historical and pedagogical, methodological and fiction literature on the subject of the study, biographical, historical and comparative methods, as well as an axiological (value) approach to the study of methodological innovations by H. Parkhurst. The author uses the materials of a number of leading scientific and pedagogical periodicals of domestic and foreign origin, including «The Integration of Education», «Scientific Notes: electronic scientific journal of Kursk State University», «Scientific Notes of Orel State University», «International Journal of Experimental Education», «Espacio, Tiempo y Educación», «The History of Education & Children's Literature», «European Journal of Contemporary Education», «The European Journal of Social Education», «IEEE Latin America Transactions», «Ricerche di Pedagogia e Didattica – Journal of Theories and Research in Education», «International Journal of
In many domestic publications, the date of birth of Helen Parkhurst is indicated on March 8, 1887 [20, p. 109]. However, Professor of Saxio University in Deventer, the Netherlands, René Berends and director of the Old Courthouse Museum in Durand, Wisconsin, USA Terry Mesch conducted a special investigation, and on the basis of the birth certificate of H. Parkhurst, stored in the Civil Registry Office of Pepin County in Durand, found that H. Parkhurst was born on Monday, March 8, but a year earlier than is commonly believed, and namely it was in 1886. H. Parkhurst was born in the hotel «Parkhurst House» belonging to the parents of Helen, and it was located on the Main Street, – the central street of a tiny, shortly before this occurred, town of Durand. All the affairs at the hotel were run by her mother, – born Ida L. Smalley. The hotel building was preserved until the winter 2010, when a strong fire destroyed it. In addition to Helen, there were two sons in the family. «The small homeland» of H. Parkhurst has long been known as «the dairy farm of America», since Wisconsin is famous for the production of milk and cheese, and residents of the state are jokingly called «cheese heads». The population of Durand consisted mainly of British and Irish immigrants who had left once their native lands not from a good life. The difficult, pioneering circumstances of their daily existence predetermined an exclusively pragmatic attitude to the arrangement of life.

The largest teacher of the second half of the XIX – first half of the XX centuries, a leading representative of the so-called American «progressive era» W. H. Kilpatrick characterized the social environment of H. Parkhurst as follows: «Where it was necessary to establish life from scratch, one’s own initiative and neighborhood cohesion were just as important as the practical experience already accumulated and the joy of some new life task that inevitably faced the settlers with the regularity of sunrise and sunset. Independence and unwillingness to fight coercion from anyone were combined in these people with an initially democratic life attitude, with ideological and religious tolerance». Undoubtedly, Helen has learned from her childhood that no one principle was absolute, and each of them could only be applied in the light of all the others. The difficult «pioneer» life, «Kilpatrick rightly argued», – was nothing more than an ideal and typical educational situation».

The life mentality of H. Parkhurst’s environment influenced the formation of her, one might say, revolutionary thinking in pedagogy. But in her native school, as a young pupil, she met something opposite to innovation, namely constant frontal training, strict discipline and moralizing. In her memoirs, she complained about being forced to sit motionless at her desk and unbearable boredom. The entire learning process was built in accordance with the principle that was usually attributed to I. F. Herbart, – «active teacher, passive student». After receiving her secondary education in 1904, Helen became a teacher at a country school in the town of Waterville.

The young teacher didn’t have any special education, but there was a burning desire to experiment and to build the educational process in a new way. Her school had only a
single classroom and a small number of pupils, and therefore all children studied together. Even in an ordinary school, it is difficult, – and most often even impossible, – to reach all children with the teacher’s attention and to achieve a positive educational result with everybody. And here children of different age levels are in the same class. How to activate their abilities? How to direct their activity in the right direction? The novice teacher began with the rearranging pupils’ tables in such a way that they formed the so-called «specialized corners» where children could work independently. The schedule of a class was still preserved at first. It, according to Helen, although partially still «connected» children, but from the very beginning they were allowed to move freely around the class and «to cooperate» with other classmates.

Although Helen worked in Waterville for only one academic year, she left such a good memory of herself that years later a stone tower with a tremendous school bell was installed in her memory. A tiled path leads to this tower, on which the names of the teachers of Pepin County were inscribed. On the bell itself there is a metal plaque with names of Parkhurst’s Waterville pupils engraved on it. However, this structure is located in front of the primary school building in another village, called Arkansaw, located four kilometers from the building where Helen worked. The school was called Black school, and still later it became known as Big Arkansaw school. The fact is that over time, the Waterville school has ceased to meet sanitary, hygienic and architectural requirements, and school classes haven’t been conducted in it for more than half a century. At one time it was used as a garage and a car repair shop, and now it is in a dilapidated state.

In 1907, Helen graduated from «the normal school» of River Falls of the Wisconsin State Teachers’ College in Milwaukee. Later, she studied at universities in Rome and Munich, and completed postgraduate studies at Columbia University. In 1909, in Tacoma, Washington, she continued working at school. In 1911-1915, H. Parkhurst taught at teachers’ colleges in Washington and Wisconsin. Until 1913, Helen worked as a teacher in an elementary school, then she became the director of the didactic department of the elementary school at the Central Teachers’ College in Milwaukee. Soon after taking office, she was released on a long business trip to Rome, where she took part in a three-month training course in pedagogy, which was personally conducted by the famous Dottoressa, – Maria Montessori.

With this meeting, the intensive cooperation of two outstanding female teachers – reformers began. In 1917-1918 Helen headed the department of teachers’ training at the Montessori College in New York; she was the head of American teachers working according to the Montessori method («supervisor of Montessori teachers in the USA»). Helen saw her task in promoting the ideas of her senior colleague and mentor among American teachers. In 1918, Parkhurst «broke away» from Dottoressa, and although she continued to lead the so-called «Montessori demonstration school», she still devoted the main attention to working on her own innovations.

In 1910, H. Parkhurst formulated a «laboratory» plan of educational work in the classroom, which was first presented at a school for children with disabilities in health. In 1918, she first applied her plan at the high school (public school) of Dalton. That’s why it was later renamed in the Dalton plan. There were only 253 people living in Dalton in 2010, Massachusetts. It was just as tiny in the first decades of the twentieth century. Here the plan of H. Parkhurst received a full-fledged embodiment in school educational practice, and it entered the history of pedagogical thought and education. (By the way, the name of the well-known lack of vision-color blindness has a completely different etymology, and it comes from the name of the English doctor John Dalton (1766-1844), who studied this medical defect).
How did Parkhurst build the organization of work at her school? Her students «on a contractual basis» worked in «laboratory teams» on specific tasks, for which they signed «contracts» with a teacher. Parkhurst canceled tests, exams and grades. While working on their tasks, wards submitted regular reports on the work done to the teacher. In 1920-1942, until her retirement, Helen Parkhurst headed the private Dalton school, where she was able to apply fully her experimental plan. The work of the school aroused exceptional interest from the world pedagogical community. Teachers from many countries came here to see the implementation of such original and even extravagant ideas in practice. Parkhurst revealed her thoughts in the book «Education on the Dalton Plan» («Education according to the Dalton Plan»), first published in London in 1922, and subsequently translated into 57 languages. Already in 1923, this book, presented by Helen Dewey and with a preface by N. K. Krupskaya, was published in Moscow [21]. Parkhurst developed her ideas in the books «Working rhythms in education» (1935) and «The Study of the Child's World» (1951).

The Dalton plan was based on the principle of individual learning. H. Parkhurst proceeded from the fact that the school was a model of society, and in society, as it was well known, everyone was for himself. So the school should prepare the child for «the struggle for social survival», where «man is a wolf to man». It is not by chance that in her book she addressed to teachers: «Let's think of the school as a social laboratory, where students themselves are experimenters, and not victims of an intricate and strict system. Let's think of it as a place where such social conditions prevail, as in real life» [22, p. 3]. That's why she believed that every student should move up «the ladder of knowledge» at his own individual and, in some ways, even unique, pace. At the same time, children learn and develop most effectively in situations characterized by such concepts as looseness and freedom of personal choice. As part of the plan, it was planned to link the program for each student with his interests and abilities, and also to ensure that each student was independent from his comrades in passing the educational material. When organizing work according to the Dalton plan, a student wasn’t bound by the general class work, because it wasn’t simply provided for. But he was given freedom, both in the choice of classes and in the use of his study time. Instead of classrooms, subject laboratories were created, and each child moved from one room to another according to his individual program.

The educational activity using the Dalton plan assumed the individual work of each student on the assimilation of the annual volume of educational material, which was divided into monthly tasks («sections», «contracts»), and those, in turn, into weekly and daily tasks. Each student was obliged to fulfill these «contracts», and at a pace independently determined by himself. It provided for detailed joint planning of the academic load by students and teachers at the very beginning of the school year.

At the disposal of students were textbooks, books from a school library, «the stuffing» of subject rooms, and laboratories, where they received advice from subject teachers while performing laboratory and practical work. That's why this method was also called «laboratory». A large place in the Dalton plan was given to summing up the work of each child. For this purpose, a rather complex system of accounting cards was used. Only in gymnastics, music, home economics classes and during various games, sports and board games, children were, of course, together. H. Parkhurst believed that her method gives children mental and moral freedom, which was expressed in the child's own pace of work on mastering the material. After students completed their tasks independently, meetings and conferences were to be organized at school to discuss the most relevant and complex issues of the curriculum.
Discussion of the results. Pro and Contra

«The Dalton plan» has become widespread in educational institutions in many countries. Adherents of the Parkhurst method point to its many positive aspects. The Dalton plan helps to increase the level of self-education of children. It makes their work with teaching tools and reference books self-evident. It’s much easier to overcome various kinds of inhibition thresholds with the Dalton plan. There is a positive atmosphere of learning, boredom and indiscipline disappear. Students can complete all the tasks at school, there are actually no homework assignments. There is a significant saving of children’s time, since the best of them can move to the next class before the end of the school year. The less gifted don’t stay for a second school year, but they simply continue their work where they left off.

On the other hand, the Dalton plan was subjected to quite reasonable criticism, first of all, for its pronounced individualistic approach, the violation of habitual contacts between teachers and schoolchildren, and even for introducing into the pedagogical process... the idea of Taylorism, i.e., the sweatshop labor system adopted in industrial production of the conveyor type.

Since 1942, H. Parkhurst has been a member of the academic council of Yale University, where she taught sociology and continued her research in the field of didactics. By the way, she was the first female teacher in the history of this prestigious university. In 1943, she received a master’s degree here. Helen Parkhurst attended lectures at the University of Munich. In 1947-1950 she hosted a weekly program on the radio, and then on television. In this program, called «The World of the Child», children were not only the main characters, but also its participants; they turned to adults with their problems. It was the first such program in the world. H. Parkhurst also organized radio programs for teenagers and for visually impaired children; about 300 programs were released in the form of conversations with children dedicated to overcoming various kinds of psychological problems. The recordings of these conversations were made into cassettes, which went on sale, and were used in a psychology training course throughout the country [23, p. 186]. In 1948, H. Parkhurst became the winner of the Radio and Television Critics Award, and in 1949, – the winner of the 13th American exhibition of educational radio.

H. Parkhurst sought to ensure that her teaching was spread in other countries as well. Thanks to her efforts, several Dalton schools were founded in England already in the 1920s. In 1928, the first such school for girls in the Netherlands was opened, and in 1931, the Dalton Association was founded. She visited Japan six times, where she gave lectures, helped local teachers in restructuring the educational process in accordance with her methodology. H. Parkhurst was received by the Empress of Japan, the Queens of Italy and the Netherlands. The wife of USA President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Eleanor, admired the work of Parkhurst, and in 1939 she financially helped her school. M. Montessori spoke about the efforts of H. Parkhurst in the field of education: «Her intelligent activity is truly rare and precious». The influence of Parkhurst’s ideas has spread all over the world. Schools that worked in accordance with her views arose in the Netherlands, England, Australia, Japan and other countries.

In the USSR in the first half of the 1920s, the People's Commissariat of Education of the RSFSR, followed by the People's Commissariats of other Union republics, sought to actively apply the achievements of foreign pedagogical thought in the practice of schools.
and universities. However, in the USSR, in the practical work of educational institutions, the method of Parkhurst has undergone significant changes. It became known as the brigade-laboratory method.

But the point, of course, is not in the name itself; its essence has been significantly distorted. At H. Parkhurst, the entire methodology was adapted for the implementation of individual work by the child. But «innovators from the People’s Commissariat of Education» couldn’t, of course, put individualism at the center of education; after all, the root idea of socialism lies precisely in the opposite side, namely, in the field of collectivism. Therefore, another word was added to the word «laboratory» – «team»; and, as a result, «the team-laboratory method» turned out. Its implementation was carried out in this way: the class was divided into teams, each of which received «a research task». The teacher didn’t act as a full-fledged source of information, didn’t conduct lessons, but only acted as a consultant; he sat in «the laboratory» somewhere «in the corner».

The Soviet writer Mikhail Grigoryevich Rozanov (1888-1938), who wrote under the pseudonym Nikolai Ognev, in a remarkably interesting story «The Diary of Kostya Ryabtsev» (1928), quotes a teenager telling his friend how school education would be held in accordance with the Dalton plan in the new academic year: «This is a system in which shkrabs (school workers) do nothing, and a student himself has to find out everything. There will be no more lessons, and students will be given tasks. These tasks will be given for a month; you can prepare them both at school and at home, and as you have prepared them, go to the laboratory to answer. Instead of classes, there will be laboratories» [24].

The Nizhny Novgorod writer Nikolai Ivanovich Kochin (1902-1983) in his novel «The Nizhny Novgorod Slope» told about studying at the pedagogical institute of the rural guy Semyon Pakharev. Upon graduation, Semyon is parted by an employee of the county department of education: «The main thing is to immediately enter the Dalton plan at school. We will ask you hard for him» [25].

Full-fledged educational classes in the form of lessons in the Soviet school were replaced in accordance with far-fetched so-called «complex plans» and «research work» of children. At the end of this work, one of a team members reported on the work done by a team. Others nodded their heads in agreement. It is clear that with such «a method» there was neither «research work» nor normal training sessions. And after all, educational work was organized in the same way in universities! However, in the early 1930s, this «freedom» was put to an end [26, p. 27]. In a number of works of Western European and American teachers who opposed scholasticism and formalism of the old school, an idea of a comprehensive construction of educational programs was also carried out (W. H. Kilpatrick, H. Parkhurst, J. Dewey). But in the practical experience of these teachers, newly announced methods were based on a material and technical base created specially for these methods in specific educational institutions. Teachers and students were also morally and methodically prepared for their introduction. That’s why these methods glorified their creators, which, by the way, allowed the author of this article to include all three of the above-mentioned didactics among the 100 great teachers of all times and peoples [27].

There was nothing of this, – neither the material base, nor the willingness of teachers to work in a new way, – in the Russian education of those years. In addition, the People’s Commissariat of Education of the RSFSR decided to introduce such drastic changes in all Russian schools without exception, and immediately, without any preliminary preparation [28, p. 13].

Leading figures of Russian education even «went further» as H. Parkhurst had gone. For example, P. P. Blonsky saw the main task of school in organizing scientific work
of schoolchildren. To do this, in his opinion, «scientific studios» should be opened in every school: physical and mathematical, biological, socio-historical, literary and philosophical, philosophical and geographical. A student, according to him, «spends half of his entire school time intended for scientific studies in transitions from one scientific studio to another, and he gives the remaining half of school time intended for scientific studies to his special classes in his chosen scientific field» [29, p. 111]. As we can see, P. P. Blonsky clearly exaggerated the possibilities of children and schools; he isn’t even talking about teaching and learning, but about the alleged scientific activities that pupils should carry out at school, and in fact independently and in the field of all sciences at once! The fact that he meant exactly scientific, and not educational activity, confirms the persistent repetition of this term, – «scientific activity». Pavel Petrovich Blonsky insisted on spending half of pupils’ working time moving from one studio to another. There is nothing to say, «the very rational» organization of work of schoolchildren «according to P. P. Blonsky»!

Under the pressure of teachers in 1931-1932, government resolutions were issued on the Soviet school. They also affected other stages of the education system (colleges, technical schools, universities), in which the use of the method of H. Parkhurst in «the modified Soviet variant», namely in the form of a team-laboratory method. As a result, the latter was strictly forbidden. There was a shuffling from side to side: first – a reckless introduction, then – a complete denial.

The situation with the introduction of the brigade-laboratory method was even reflected in «The Gulag Archipelago», where A. I. Solzhenitsyn wrote about those teachers who were subjected to repression for refusing to introduce the Dalton plan and the brigade-laboratory method. A few years later, after the release of the above-mentioned government resolutions, those teachers, who managed to successfully implement the Dalton plan and the brigade-laboratory method in the practice of their school work, were severely punished [30, p. 66]. Does all of the above said cast a shadow on the method of H. Parkhurst? Of course, not. Any, even the most useful thing, becomes a source of danger when used improperly; at the same time, the more effective this thing is, the higher the potential danger.

H. Parkhurst spent the last years of her life in the village of Sturbridge, Massachusetts. This place is famous for the fact that it recreates the atmosphere of life in New England (i.e. in the USA) in the 1790s – 1830s. Visitors are greeted by costumed guides and shown a cider mill, a tavern, a colonial goods store and other recreated attractions of a bygone era. Helen Parkhurst's life was cut short by an accident. She died in New Milford, Connecticut, on June 1, 1973 due to the consequences of a severe injury caused by a fall.

Conclusions

Currently, the ideas of a remarkable American teacher are experiencing a second youth. Yuri Podkopaev, a Russian teacher of mathematics and computer science, who got acquainted with the activities of two schools operating under the Dalton Plan system in the Netherlands. He identified three main differences compared to the methods of ordinary schools. Y. Podkopaev attributed to them: changing the format of a lesson and transferring a teacher to an advisory and guiding role; a daily hour of independent work for schoolchildren (Dalton hours); a qualitative and meaningful assessment system that allows tracking the dynamics of each student [31].
Confirmation of the value of Parkhurst’s ideas is the fact that today the project method, as the principle of organizing any activity, as well as her other ideas, are widely used in all areas of life, without exception, including pedagogy. Her scientific heritage is carefully studied by both foreign [32; 33] and domestic researchers [34; 35]. However, as it turned out as a result of the survey, the majority of residents of Pepin County, not to mention USA citizens in general, had no idea who H. Parkhurst was, despite all her titles, awards and worldwide lifetime recognition. Members of the Historical Society in Durand, headed by T. Mesch, are making efforts to ensure that as many people as possible learn about the most famous native of the city. The local museum (the Old Courthouse museum), – previously the Pepin County government was housed in its building, – contains a small archive of photographs and documents related to H. Parkhurst. But the main thing is that Dalton Plan is currently accepted in many schools around the world. More than 200 Dalton School educational clusters are successfully operating in Australia, Austria, Belgium, Great Britain, the Netherlands, the USA, Chile, the Czech Republic, South Korea and Japan. In 2014, Forbes magazine (USA) ranked Dalton School on East Street (New York) on the 10th place among the best private educational institutions of the USA [36, p. 238].

Everything stated above in the article, in our opinion, is a confirmation that Helen Parkhurst can be attributed to one of the most outstanding figures of pedagogical science and education of all times and peoples. Further research of her methodological heritage will certainly be able to contribute to the successful solution of modern problems facing modern domestic education.
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