

The Ideas Of Adult Education In Russian And Ukrainian Heritage End Of Xix – Beginning Of Xx Centuries

Liudmyla Tymchuk
Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University,
Chernivtsi, Ukraine
l.tymchuk@chnu.edu.ua

Received 14.02.2017; Accepted 27.02. 2017

Abstract

Analyzed have been the ideas of adult education and its place in the pedagogical heritage at the end of XIX – beginning XX centuries. We studied on the basis of works of A. Schjapov, A. Pruhavin, V. Vahterov, P. Kazanzev, O. Hermonius, H. Falbork, S. Siripolko the main ideas and basic notions of adults' education which were developed at the end of XIX – beginning XX centuries in the form of out-of-school education theory. We can state that at the end of XIX – beginning XX century in the form of out-of-school education theory there were established theoretical foundations of adult education. Fundamental ideas were formed and scientific problems and contradictions were emphasized. Search for optimal forms and methods of work were performed. Such scientists as E. Medynskyj, S. Siropolko, V. Charnaluskij etc formed the main principles of out-of-school education. The analyze of theoretical views shows that fundamental ideas of scientists end of XIX – beginning XX century are not only contradictive to each other and to the main principles of pedagogic movement but also complete each other. Wide range of basic ideas of adult education was originally formulated in the works of V. Charnouskyj and later they were concretized in the works of S. Siropolko and developed in the theoretical views of E. Medynskyj. Now we can speak about important works dedicated to the theory and praxis of adult education of leading scientists of the beginning of XX century.

Keywords: *Adults' education, adults' education theory, out-of-school education theory.*

1. Topicality of the problem. The corner stone of modern establishment processes of democratic, social, law-based state, renovation of its socioeconomic and mental development conditions of Ukrainian society is the concept of study during the whole life and education of adults as its main strategy. According to Hamburg's declaration the notion "adult education" is "the whole complex of ongoing processes of formal study or other forms of study which helps people, who are adults from the point of view of society, to develop their skills, to enrich their knowledge and to improve technical and professional skills or to use them in some new direction to fulfill their needs or needs of society" [16].

The priority of adult education as an important motive factor of sociocultural progress and personal development became an object of attention for practice and science.

2.Degree of scientific development of the problem. The middle of XX century is traditionally considered to be the period of formation the foundation of adult education. In this period the andragogy began its dynamic development. Andragogy is a new scientific discipline which set up new specific approaches to organize the adults' study. Beginning with 1950-1960 there were created academic and professional institutions, appeared new publications about different aspects of adult education and created new "Education through the whole Life" program for adults etc. Scientists from different countries (USA – M. Knowles, W. Smith, Great Britain – P. Jarvis, Germany – F. Poeggeler, Switzerland – H. Hanselman, Yugoslavia – D. Savicevic, B. Samolovce, M. Ogruzovych, Poland – E. Radlinska, M. Semenski, L. Tuross, USSR – A. Darnutskyj, J. Kuljutkin, S. Vershlovkyj, H. Onushkin) studied the wide range of interacted questions such as: how do the adults study; what are their main educational needs; what should be the main principles and methods of their studies like; what is the specificity of relationship in the adults' educational system etc. In such a way problems which are typical for andragogy were formed.

3.Problem definition. Despite that fact that andragogy science became independent not very long time ago its roots go back to the end of XIX – beginning of XX century. It is the famous period in the Ukrainian history, period of activation of civil educational movement. In the 50-60's of the XX century the great changes in the politico-social and socioeconomic branches of Russia and Austro-Hungarian Empire where Ukraine belonged (cancellation of serfdom, rapid development of industry and economy, growth of material manufacture, renovation of forms and methods of the agriculture branch etc.) were in great necessity of qualified and competent workers. There were high requirements to the level of literacy, education and development of working people. It became obvious to create educational institutions first of all for adults. Among them the first were Sunday schools, public readings, libraries, night evening schools, revisional schools and public universities. On the Ukrainian's western territories except for above mentioned, there were widely implemented reading courses for analphabet (illiterate people), scientific lectures and handicraft courses.

The intensive processes of adult educational institutions development were followed by active affords to understand and to develop the main questions of organization, contents, forms and methods of adult education which led to first pedagogic ideas and conceptions in this field. It's obvious that on the first steps there were no common terms to define both the categorical mechanism of adult education and the educational activity. Mentioned above phenomenon were recently identified as "educational activities", "spreading of literacy to people", "Sunday movement", "enlightenment of people" etc.

But in the 90's of the XIX century there were noticed sufficient changes regarding the mentioned aspect. In the pedagogical circles, scientific and publicistic literature (A. Schjapov, A. Pruhavin, H. Falbork, V. Vahterov, P. Kazanzev) appeared the term "out-of-school education" which was defined as the complex of all kinds of enlightenment activity directed on the various strata of adult society.

4.Aim of this article is to observe the processes of scientific understanding of the basic notions and ideas of adult education in the context of theoretical formulation of the out-of-school education conception on the basis of primary source analyze.

5.Presentation of the main material. The notion was first used in the report with the headline “Out-of-school education”, which were presented by H. Falbork on the meeting of St. Petersburg’s literacy committee in winter 1893-1894 [3. p. 14].

The usage of analogical term was fixed in the protocols of second meeting of representatives of technological and professional science (December 27, 1895 – January 10, 1896) where J. Abramov, H. Alchevska, V. Vahterov, O. Kajdanova, A. Kalmykova, M. Rubakin took part. While discussing questions about general adult education one of the participants N. Tulupov used the term “out-of-school education”. According to N. Tupolov by this term we should understand a wide range of institutions which should help people to get knowledge by using their tasks and to help that part of people who have passed the school age [15, p.370].

A.Pruhavin in the introduction to the second edition of book called “Requirements of people and duties of intelligentsia in the educational field” (1895) used the notion “out-of-school education for people” in the same meaning. To this type of the educational activity he reckoned among “the books and pictures publishing and their spreading among people, organization of libraries, reading rooms, bookstores, public readings etc.” [8, p. 12].

When the notion “out-of-school education” appeared there were noticed first attempts of scientific reflection of educational questions for adults. The first pedagogue who started to develop the out-of-school education theory was V. Vahterov. In 1896 he wrote the book “Out-of-school education for people” and the brochure “Sunday schools and revisional classes in villages” (1896). In two years in the collected book of Moscow’s literacy committee were published works of V. Vahterov about Sunday schools, revisional classes and bookstores [14, p. 1-103, 293 - 317]. Since that time and till the last days he worked on development of theory and praxis of the out-of-school theory. The book of V. Vahterov “Out-of-school education for people” differentiates from the book of A. Prugavin by the general statements of questions. Studying the Ukrainian and foreign experience he was one of the first scientists who presented his approach to the system of out-of-school intuition. According to V. Vahterov Sunday schools should have become the core of whole range of educational establishments for people and on their basis there should have been the libraries and reading rooms. Sunday schools could have filial branches and they shouldn’t have had the strict regimentation to their methods of study, schedule, set of pupils, teaching methods or to the source of financing. Having proved the necessity of interaction of different types of out-of-school education V. Vahterov claimed that “only the complex of these measures can lead to positive solving of the most important task of our time – to educate the masses”. There exists a strong connection between all listed establishments. The best way to persuade illiterate person in the usefulness of books are public readings. While listening a person wants to learn how to read and as a result we need Sunday schools. If we have schools we should suggest book for reading and to help using it.” [1, p. 85].

Considerable contribution into the adults' education theory was a book of P. Kazanzeva "Tasks of out-of-school education". In this book the author generalized the experience of Sunday schools, opened their role, tasks, social implication, organizational and deductive foundations, requirements for teacher and teaching methodology of language and arithmetic [4]. Author also describes the plan of university development which should follow Sunday schools and become widespread. Therefore the main task of Sunday schools according to the author is to prepare the ground for public universities.

Important contribution to the out-of-school education theory made V. Charnoluzkyj. He is the author of the work "The main questions in the organization of out-of-school education" (1909), numerous articles, reports, reference editions of out-of-school education with detail description. The pedagogue said that the main task of adult education was to learn the illiterate people "simple reading and writing". He tried to classify types of out-of school education forms: 1) Schools for adults; 2) Establishments for reading (libraries, social editions, book selling); 3) establishments for special and scientific knowledge (courses, lectures, readings); 4) public leisure time (theater, different entertainments); 5) museums and art galleries; 6) national house. The author has also studied self - education. [13, p 2].

V. Charnoluzkyj in his works drew the demarcative line between school education and out-of-school education. According to the author the school education is a complex of educational institutions aimed at systematical studies of young generations for their general development (system of general education institution) and preparation for practical activity (system of professional and special educational institutions). The out-of-school education is a complex of different institutions aimed at complacency of mental and artistic needs of people who have different kinds of school education and also people who for different reasons don't have school education [12, p. 85]. Thus the aim of out-of-school education is to fulfill mental and aesthetical needs of a person. Having analyzed both types of education author has made conclusions that despite their multiplicity and diversity of out-of-school education forms they have common trail: they are separate from school education. At the same time he mentioned that "we can't draw sharp line between school and out-of-school education" [12, p. 86].

Unlike his foregoers V. Charnoluzkyj pays attention not to the separate types of out-of-school education but studies it in general as natural system. According to the aim of the out-of-school education as the fulfillment of mental and aesthetic needs of a person the author in his works pays a lot of attention to a person, his mental and aesthetic problems and also the possibilities for their fulfillment. He stated that "some of these needs people fulfill by themselves and require from social institutions only creation of conditions which can help to develop their self-activity. But it is difficult for people to fulfill other needs. As a result there appeared different forms of social mutual help such as voluntary organizations or just smaller amount of people" [13, p. 3].

Works of S. Siropolko are dedicated to the research of interrelation between school and out-of-school education. In the 1910's there appeared his publications, connected with problems of out-of school education: "Out-of-school education: collection of articles" (1912), "Main questions of out-of school education" (1913), "Country council and library services (dedicated to the 50th

anniversary of establishment of country council)” (1914), “Public teacher and out-of-school education” (1914). The last work is the report of S. Siropolko on II Russian conference named after K. Ushynskij which took place at the end of December 1913 – beginning of January 1914. In this work author systematized existent in that time main approaches for the determination of the core of out-of-school education and showed them in two main positions: 1) out-of-school education is not self-sustaining but is the appendage of school education; 2) out-of-school education is self-sustaining and plays the most important role in determination of cultural development tempo.

Being the adherent of second approach S. Siropolko considered that the necessity of out-of school education depended on quantity of illiterate people who passed school age and couldn't use the ordinary schools” [11, p. 5]. Thus the main task of all types of out-of-school establishments is to give general education and special technical knowledge. In such a way the main task of out-of-school establishments according to S. Siropolko was to give the first level of education to the illiterate people. The actuality of this task he explained by disagreement of specialists about determination of specific forms and methods of out-of school education.

We should take into account that by terms out-of-school and school education author meant not only specific systems but main establishments which perform one or another type of studies. S. Siropolko considered that these were schools and national houses. On the one hand such an approach proves the existence of different kinds of out-of-school establishments and independence of out-of-school education. But on the other hand such out-of-school establishments such as national houses and national universities are mostly occupied with outreach activities with illiterate people but their main task is to give general education.

While solving these problems out of school establishments have to use strategies, methods and teaching method borrowed from school system education. “Are the Sunday schools, additional and revisional schools, public universities use the same methods and principles as are used in the school system?” – asked S. Siropolko rhetorical question and gave the answer “I think that any kind of school is designed to give knowledge. That is why “out-of-school education” has forms borrowed from “school education” [10, p. 9]. But if tools used in out-of-school educations are the same as in school education it gives author the reasons to make conclusions that there are no specific tasks in the out-of-school education which should be solved with the help of specific tools and methods.

Such position seems to us quite reasonable though there is no doubt that it differentiates from those which was taken by leading pedagogues of that period. Despite that fact that opinion of S. Siropolko on theory and organization of out-of-school education were different than of some representatives of pedagogic movement of that time his publications were extensively discussed and quoted by pedagogues.

A. Hermonius reported with interesting works about methods of out-of-school education. His conclusions about the main principles of out-of-school education were as follows: 1) out-of-school education is self-sustaining; 2) Out-of-school education plays an important role; 3) the school education alone is ineffective; 4) out-of-school education should not be confused with adult education, but sometimes these notions coincide [2, p. 14]. A. Hermonius wrote “...in fact, the primary importance in terms of enlightenment has only out-of school education ” and “school plays

only support role” [2, p.15]. In such a way A. Hermonius presents out-of-school education on the higher level and as a result deemphasizes the role of school education. We consider it to be quite unfounded.

M. Rubakin in his works “Letters to readers about self-education” (1913), “Praxis of self-education” (1914) takes more tolerant position. The author writes that out-of-school education plays an independent role and in comparison to school education has wider possibilities. “Out-of-school education is not limited with education program and is as multi-faceted as our life. Out-of-school education does not controvert school education but is its essential addition.” [9, p. 26]. M. Rubakin claimed not to stop self-education and expressed an idea of uninterrupted education [9, p. 34].

E. Medynskyj demonstrated that of out-of-school education has wider range of tasks then school education. The scientist stressed that in the first case we deal with cultural development of all people and in the second case only with preparation for the development of part of the population [6, p.9].

E. Medynskyj is considered to be one of the leading specialists in the field of out-of-school education in the pre-revolutionary period. In 1912 he was invited to the Pedagogical academy to give lectures about out-of school education for those who were in charge of public education in country council. Preparation and the process of lecturing helped him to systematize existing at that time approaches and his attitude to the whole range of questions connected with the organization of out-of-school education in the country. His book “Out-of-school education, its meaning, organization and technique” was published in 1913 and the book “Methods of out-of-school education. Experience for librarian, lectors, people who work with adults and those who are in charge of national houses etc.” was published in 1915. These books were republished for several times. As many modern scientists said these books became foundation for scientific approach to organization of adult education. In the introduction to the book “Out-of-school education, its meaning, organization and technique” the author wrote that “currently we can notice intense interest to the questions of out-of-school education. These questions are highly discussed on the pages of pedagogic magazines and on country council gathering. A lot of libraries and courses for adults were opened and extensive plans were developed.” [6, p.5]. But however according to E. Medynskyj “publishing of such book where the main questions about out-of-school education would be answered, the connection between forms of perception and the main advices about organization and technique of these forms would be given. The edition of such book seemed to me extremely necessary according to the conditions of that moment and according to the demand of our literature (mainly of magazines)” [6, p.6]

Thus E. Medynskyj emphasizes two interrelated problems which are typical for that period of out-of-school education development. They are: first of all absence of stable opinions on correspondence between different forms of out-of-school education and second of all absence of literature that would systematize these opinions. And according to E. Medynskyj the absence of such scientific and practical literature was the reason that “out-of-school education in most cases was still studied as a range of separate, unrelated educational measures and maybe because of this reaso scientists often add such words as “so-called” to the notion out-of school education[6, p. 6].

Among other works printed in that time E. Medynskyj emphasized only the book of S. Siropolko called “Out-of-school education”. According to E. Medynskyj there were no such works where “these separate forms were studied as a part of one structural organization of out-of-school education. A lot of questions were only touched upon slightly.” (Ibidem, 6). He also stressed that this book can’t replace that serious preparation which need present and future specialists in the field of out-of-school education but “if only it sparks the interest to educational work and partially fulfill the needs of current moment and gives some practical advices to the local workers the author’s aim will be achieved” (Ibidem, p. 7).

E. Medynskyj was against those determinations of out-of school education which came to simple recitation of its different forms and didn’t reveal its subject matter. The scientist said: “Some scientists give the forms of assistance saying that out-of-school education is libraries, public readings, courses for adults etc; some of them only say that out-of school education is just obtaining knowledge “out of school”; Some scientists are trying to study the notion of out-of-school education claiming that education can be only out-of-school and what we usually call “school education” is nothing more than preparation for study” (Ibidem).

While trying to explain the subject matter of out-of school education E. Medynskyj supported the position of A. Hermonius who thought that “epithet “out-of-school” didn’t explain anything and in relation with word “education” is redundant” (Hermonyus, 1913, 17). E Medynskyj considered that the term out-of-school education is not correct and can lead to misunderstandings. These misunderstandings can be connected with the fact that “education first of all means intellectual functioning of a person” (Ibidem). According to author the notion “development” is broader and is determined as constant inner activity of person with all elements of inner man not only psychical but also physical. And thus “the harmonically developed person is considered only a person who is widely developed in mental, moral, esthetical and physical meanings.” (Medynskyy, 1918, 5). According to his considerations E. Medynskyj made a conclusion that the word “development” is the most appropriate for the notion out-of-school education because “out-of-school education is aimed not only at mental development but also at harmonic development. That is why to forms that help out-of-school education belong not only libraries, courses for adults and museums which helps mental development but also theaters concerts, art galleries which helps artistic skills and sport to develop physically (Medynskyy, 1918, 6).

According to fact that out-of-school education is equal to all-round development author emphasizes “two extremely important consequences:

- 1) the task of all out-of-school establishments is not only educational but also ampliative. thus it is more important for people who go to the libraries, public readings, school for adults not only to memorize but also to develop mental capacity and to spark the interest for further development;
- 2) the whole system of help to the out-of-school education should be formed in such a way that all sides of personal development (mental and physical) could get satisfactory results. This system should be directed on all-round development: mental, esthetical, moral and physical [6, p. 6].

Thus it is obvious that on this step of scientific work E. Medynskyj considers that out-of-school education is in the all-round development of people and includes mental, esthetical, moral and physical development. The scientist also stressed that “the main characteristic of out-of-school education is the individual character of this process and self-activity of a person. Person only uses the material which is given by libraries, lectures, courses, museums, theaters etc and depending on the individuality works on this material. Therefore all the forms of perceptions in the out-of-school education can be formed to fulfill personal needs of each person.” (Ibidem).

E. Medynskyj proved that out-of-school education has more considerable tasks in comparison to school:

“First of all the tasks of out-of-school education is wider than in school (in the first case we have only cultural development of all population and in the second we have only preparation for this development.);

Second of all out-of-school education is more or less is peculiar for all people. School is visited not by all people;

Third of all out-of-school education (when we speak about the development of personality in general, not only using libraries, courses, museums) cannot be substituted with something else. But school sometimes can be substituted by some forms of out-of-school education (Sunday school, courses for adults etc.) and even by home study;

Fourth of all out-of-school education is a goal in and of itself and doesn't need further support. And with the absence of out-of-school education school can lose its meaning and time spent by pupils is underproductive.” (Ibidem).

E. Medynskyj paid great attention to systemization of methods of out-of-school educational work. He emphasized eight main principles of methods of out-of-school education: general development of people; the study of world around with separate questions; Flexibility of tools of out-of-school work; all-round fulfillment of cultural needs; mutual work of out-of-school establishment; self action of people. According to author the problems of methodical support of out-of-school education was that all the on-topic literature which was at the beginning of XX century described only quantitative side of organization of out-of-school education. In the third edition of “Out-of-school education methods” E. Medynskyj emphasizes that “lack of on-topic literature, absence of generally accepted terms, newness of the topic <...> stopped me from getting into details” (Medynskyj , 1918, 7). These factors were probably the reason why author was not satisfied with materials which were in the first edition. And he considered that the material were too general.

Till 1917 the scientific literature connected with problems of out-of-school education was presented wider. In the edited in that time “Systematic handbook of articles about out-of school education” written by E. Medynskyj and I. Lapshov were 384 items. Among them there were books and scientific articles which showed the great interest of pedagogues to this topic. Above mentioned fundamental works connected with development and formation of out-of-school education were of great interest.

Conclusions. We can state that at the end of XIX – beginning XX century in the form of out-of-school education theory there were established theoretical foundations of adult education. Fundamental ideas were formed and scientific problems and contradictions were emphasized. Search for optimal forms and methods of work were performed. Such scientists as E. Medynskyj, S. Siropolko, V.Charnaluskyj etc formed the main principles of out-of-school education.

The analyze of theoretical views shows that fundamental ideas of scientists end of XIX – beginning XX century are not only contradictive to each other and to the main principles of pedagogic movement but also complete each other. Wide range of basic ideas of adult education was originally formulated in the works of V.Charnouskyj and later they were concretized in the works of S. Siropolko and developed in the theoretical views of E. Medynskyj. Now we can speak about important works dedicated to the theory and praxis of adult education of leading scientists of the beginning of XX century.

References

A.

1. Вахтеров В.П. Внешкольное образование народа / П.П.Вахтеров. – Москва, 1896. – 380 с.
2. Гермониус А.К. Внешкольное образование, формы и действительное значение / А.К.Гермониус // С.-Петербургский земский вестник. - 1913. – Февраль. - С.14–26.
3. Горностаев П.В. О теории общего образования взрослых до Октября и в первые годы после революции / П.В.Горностаев. – М., 1974. – 85 с.
4. Казанцев П.Н. Задачи внешкольного образования: Вып.1 / П.Н.Казанцев. – Саратов: паровая типо-лит. Г.Х. Шельгорн и К°, 1904.
5. Медынский Е., Лапшов И. Систематический указатель книг и статей по внешкольному образованию / Е. Медынский, И.Лапшов. - М.: Наука, 1916. – 120 с.
6. Медынский Е.Н. Внешкольное образование, его значение, организация и техника: 3-е изд., доп. и перераб. / Е.Н.Медынский.- М.: Наука, 1918. - 322 с.
7. Медынский Е.Н. Методы внешкольной просветительной работы. -3-е изд. / Е.Н.Медынский. - М.: Наука, 1918. - 166 с.
- 8.Пругавин А.С. Запросы народа и обязанности интеллигенции в области просвещения и воспитания / А.С.Пругавин. – СПб., 1895. – 547 с.
9. Рубакин Н.А. Избранное: В 2-х т. / Н.А Рубакин. – М.: Книга, 1975. – Т.2. – 1975. – 280 с.
10. Серополко С.О. Основные вопросы внешкольного образования / С.О.Серополко. - М.: Изд. журнала «Народный учитель», 1913. - 63 с.
11. Серополко С. Внешкольное образование: сб.статей / С.Серополко. – М.: Изд. журнала «Педагогический листок», 1912. - 128 с.
12. Чарнолуцкий В. Основные вопросы внешкольного образования в России // Русская школа. – 1908 в. - №8. – С.70-99.
13. Чарнолуцкий В. Основные вопросы организации внешкольного образования в России. – СПб.: Типогр. И.Н.Скорородова, 1909. – 90 с.
14. Частный почин в деле народного образования. Сборник статей. – М., 1894. - 361 с.
15. 2-й съезд русских деятелей по техническому и профессиональному образованию в России. 1895-1896. Секция IX общих вопросов. Часть 2. - М. : Городская Типографія, 1898-521 с.
16. Hamburg Declaration on Adult Learning. The Fifth International Conference, on Adult Education. — Hamburg. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Access mode: <http://www.unesco.org/education/uie/confintea/declaeng.htm>

B.

1. Vakhterov V.P. Vneshkol'noe obrazovanye naroda / P.P.Vakhterov. – Moskva, 1896. – 380 s.
2. Hermonyus A.K. Vneshkol'noe obrazovanye, formy y deystvytel'noe znachenye / A.K.Hermonyus // S.-Peterburskiy zemskiy vestnyk. - 1913. – Fevral'. - S.14–26.
3. Hornostaev P.V. O teoryi obshchego obrazovaniya vzroslykh do Oktyabrya y v pervye hody posle revolyutsyy / P.V.Hornostaev. – M., 1974. – 85 s.
4. Kazantsev P.N. Zadachy vneshkol'noho obrazovaniya: Vyp.1 / P.N.Kazantsev. – Saratov: parovaya typo-lyt. H.KH. Shel'horn y K°, 1904.
5. Medynskyy E., Lapshov Y. Systematicheskiy ukazatel' knyh y statey po vneshkol'nomu obrazovaniyu / E. Medynskyy, Y.Lapshov. - M.: Nauka, 1916. – 120 s.
6. Medynskyy E.N. Vneshkol'noe obrazovanye, eho znachenye, orhanyzatsyya y tekhnika: 3-e yzd., dop. y pererab. / E.N.Medynskyy. - M.: Nauka, 1918. - 322 s.
7. Medynskyy E.N. Metody vneshkol'noy prosvetytel'noy raboty. -3-e yzd. / E.N.Medynskyy. - M.: Nauka, 1918. - 166 s.
8. Pruhavyn A.S. Zaprosy naroda y obyazannosti yntellyhentsyy v oblasti prosveshchenyya y vospytaniya / A.S.Pruhavyn. – SPb., 1895. – 547 s.
9. Rubakyn N.A. Yzbrannoe: V 2-kh t. / N.A.Rubakyn. – M.: Knyha, 1975. – T.2. – 1975. – 280 s.
10. Seropolko S.O. Osnovnye voprosy vneshkol'noho obrazovaniya / S.O.Seropolko. - M.: Yzd. zhurnala «Narodnyy uchitel'», 1913. - 63 s.
11. Seropolko S. Vneshkol'noe obrazovanye: sb.statey / S.Seropolko. – M.: Yzd. zhurnala «Pedagogicheskiy lystok», 1912. - 128 s.
12. Charnolusskiy V. Osnovnye voprosy vneshkol'noho obrazovaniya v Rossyy // Russkaya shkola. – 1908 v. - №8. – S.70-99.
13. Charnolusskiy V. Osnovnye voprosy orhanyzatsyy vneshkol'noho obrazovaniya v Rossyy. – SPb.: Typohr. Y.N.Skorokhodova, 1909. – 90 s.
14. Chastnyy pochyn v dele narodnoho obrazovaniya. Sbornyk statey. – M., 1894. - 361 s.
15. 2-y s"ezd ruskyykh deyateley po tekhnicheskomu y professional'nomu obrazovaniyu v Rossyy. 1895-1896. Sektsyya IKH obshchyykh voprosov. Chast' 2. - M. : Horodskaya Typohrafiya, 1898-521 s.
16. Hamburg Declaration on Adult Learning. The Fifth International Conference, on Adult Education. — Hamburg. — [Elektronnyy resurs]. — Access mode: <http://www.unesco.org/education/uie/confintea/declaeng.htm>