

Pedagogy: A Discipline under Diverse Appellations

Iveta Kestere
Iveta Ozola

University of Latvia
Jūrmalas gatve 74/76,
Rīga LV 1084, Latvia
e-mail: iveta.kestere@lu.lv
e-mail: iveta.ozola1@gmail.com

Abstract: *The history of educational institutions is a widely studied issue, while the history of pedagogy as a scientific discipline has attracted researchers' attention only since the late 1990s, and it still remains an insufficiently studied issue both in the Baltic States and elsewhere in Europe. Thus, the purpose of the present article is to give an insight in the historical development of pedagogy as a scientific discipline and to characterise the current situation in the science of pedagogy as well.*

Germany has always been the leader among European countries with regard to the development of pedagogy as a scientific discipline. That is why the development of pedagogy in Latvia has been studied within the context of German experience, tracing a lot of analogies with the other Baltic States. The sources of the study included textbooks in pedagogy used by teacher training institutions in the territory of Latvia, pedagogical literature and the press. The theoretical framework for the understanding of the development of pedagogy was based on the criteria for the formation of pedagogy as a scientific discipline worked out by Rita Hofstetter and Bruno Schneuwly. The key idea used in the present article is the one concerning the creation of scientific knowledge which forms a theoretical model and which has been obtained by means of proper research methods as one of the criteria for the formation of a science.

In the beginning, the theory of pedagogy developed as part of theology and philosophy. During the Enlightenment in the 18th century, when universities focused on teacher education, their professors started paying increasing attention to the development of pedagogical theory – the definitions of key concepts and the formation of the structure of pedagogy. This process proceeded particularly fast in the second

part of the 19th century and in the first decades of the 20th century. At that time, pedagogy became an academic discipline in Latvia as well, since a course of studies in pedagogy was offered at the University of Latvia, founded in 1919.

The close link of pedagogy with philosophy and theology in the initial period of its development was determined by its research methodology – human education was studied theoretically. However, at the end of the 18th century there emerged an idea about empirical pedagogical research – namely, observations. The development of psychology and sociology in the late 19th century and the early 20th century enriched pedagogy with methods characteristic of these sciences (tests, surveys, interviews, etc.). Nevertheless, the discussion between the adherents of the humanities and social sciences in the field of pedagogy continued for a long time until the 1960s when pedagogy finally joined the camp of social sciences adopting such research methods as surveys, interviews, case studies, as well as statistical data processing methods as its own. Still, complete disregard of the research traditions of the humanities could discourage the further development of pedagogical theories.

Initially, the structure of pedagogy developed as practical tips for teachers, which were gradually arranged in a theoretical system traditionally comprising the history of pedagogy, the theory of upbringing, didactics, and school management. As the area of educators' activity gradually expanded and reached beyond school premises, the pedagogical theory had to embrace an increasingly wider field of research as well. Since the 1960s, there have appeared new directions of the pedagogical practice and research like adult education, environmental pedagogy, media pedagogy, etc.

The indistinct borders of the field of pedagogy and the variability of research methodologies have also affected the denomination of the pedagogical discipline: in different countries different terms are used to refer to pedagogy. The terms used in the English language are 'education', 'educational science(s)', 'pedagogy'; two terms 'Pädagogik' and 'Erziehungswissenschaft' are used in the German language, while in French three different terms coexist with each other: 'pédagogie', 'science de l'éducation/sciences de l'éducation'. In Lithuanian the term 'edukologija' is used, 'pedagoogika' and 'kasvatusteadus', 'haridusteadus' in Estonian, and 'pedagoģija' and 'izglītības zinātnes' in the Latvian language.

Just like the discussions concerning the denomination of pedagogy, the debate about its structure and research methodologies is still ongoing. It should be noted, though, that nowadays when interdisciplinary research is in vogue, the amorphousness of the field of pedagogy is not a drawback; on the contrary, it enables us to use the achievements of other sciences in a flexible way in order to tackle pedagogical problems.

Keywords: *educational sciences, pedagogical research, pedagogy*

Introduction

The history of pedagogy can be examined in two ways: both as the history of education and upbringing and as the history of a particular scientific discipline (Kron, 2001, p. 25). Although different pedagogical guidelines and ideas can be found in literary, philosophical, political and religious texts created since the dawn of civilization, pedagogy has developed as a separate academic discipline comparatively recently. That is why the origins and the development of upbringing and education have been extensively studied, while the history of pedagogy as an academic discipline attracted researchers' attention only in the last decades of the 20th century, and it still remains an insufficiently studied issue both in the Baltic States and elsewhere in Europe. The purpose of the present article is to give an insight into the historical development of pedagogy as a scientific discipline and to characterise the current situation in the science of pedagogy as well.

As a result of an extensive study, the Swiss scientists Hofstetter and Schneuwly have worked out four criteria which characterize the formation of pedagogy as an academic discipline:

- 1) *Scientific production of knowledge, based on the elaboration and continuous renewal of concepts and theoretical models that constitute objects of knowledge, and of methods of data collection and analysis.*
- 2) *Institutional foundation that allows the professionalization of research through the existence of chairs, studies, researchers and specialized research groups, laboratories, institutes.*
- 3) *Communication networks constituted by means of publication (journals, series of specialized books, grey literature), of research associations on the different levels of the academic building, of scientific events (congresses, conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.).*

4) *Socialization by different modes of education and of recruitment for researchers and manifesting itself by the disciplinary affiliation by the biography of the researchers* (Hofstetter & Schneuwly, 2003, p. 56).

In the present article, we are mainly going to focus on the analysis of the first criterion since the knowledge obtained as a result of scientific cognition by means of scientific research methods and arranged in a certain system is the cornerstone for the foundation of any science (Vedins, 2008; Wahrig-Burfeind, 2006; Kron, 1999; Tschamler, 1983).

To illustrate the development of pedagogy as a scientific discipline, a Latvian example linked with the German context will be used, as this country has been a recognized leader in the field of pedagogy for centuries, and the genesis of pedagogy as a scientific discipline, which started in the German territory, has had a significant impact on the development of pedagogy elsewhere in Europe, including the Baltic States up to the year 1940 (Krūze *et al.*, 2009).

The development of pedagogy as a scientific discipline was mainly studied in the period starting from the second half of the 19th century till the mid-1930s, which was the time when the processes concerning the development of pedagogy as a scientific discipline were particularly dynamic in Europe, and pedagogy formed as a separate scientific discipline in Latvia as well. The article does not examine pedagogy as a scientific discipline after the occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union in 1940, as development of pedagogy was continued in the context of radically different paradigm and analysis of this complicated situation would significantly expand the scope of this article. It should be also pointed out that the present article will not address the legacy of particular educationalists as we have been mainly interested in the pedagogical discipline as a multidimensional phenomenon within the context of the respective epoch.

The sources used in the present research included the curricula in pedagogy used by teacher training institutions which were available in the Latvian State Historical Archives, textbooks in pedagogy, pedagogical literature and the press.

Although the term ‘education’ is more widely used in the English language, the word ‘pedagogy’ will be used in the present article in order to demonstrate changes in the pedagogical terminology more precisely.

The development of pedagogical research methodology as the basis for the formation of pedagogy as a scientific discipline

In order to be recognised as a separate scientific discipline, the knowledge concerning pedagogical issues has to be *scientific*, that is obtained as a result of scientific cognition by means of scientific research methods and arranged in a certain system; besides, separate elements of the system have to be logically related to each other (Vedins, 2008; Wahrig-Burfeind, 2006; Kron, 1999; Tschamler, 1983).

Initially, pedagogy as an academic discipline existed in the world as part of philosophy or theology, which also determined its research methodologies – they were theoretical reflections about education or practical tips for teachers and other educators based on personal experience. In the late 18th century, under the influence of the Enlightenment, the process concerning the disciplinary emancipation of pedagogy started gradually. At the end of the 18th century, as a result of the rapid development of natural sciences, the view that not only theoretical but also empirical study of the child was possible, mainly by means of observation, was voiced louder and louder. Nevertheless, the progress in this direction was slow as the views on the method of observation were different. The first researchers studying children tried to collect as much empirical material as possible in order to formulate the theory of the soul based on the analysis of observations (Schmid, 2006, pp. 29–30).

A new debate in the field of pedagogy was started by Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911), who criticised the attempts to transfer the worldview based on natural sciences and their methodological model to human sciences as too naïve. Dilthey, who was the founder of the humanities pedagogy (*geisteswissenschaftliche Pädagogik*), which is still popular in Germany, developed the theory of understanding – the theory concerning the understanding and interpretation of human activity in the context of a certain period and society. Dilthey believed that nature could be explained, but the life of the soul – *understood* (Löwisch, 2002).

At the end of the 19th century, the flourishing of psychology and sociology and the penetration of these sciences into the field of pedagogy gave new impetus for pedagogical research. Observation, measurements, tests, experiments and statistics were used both in Europe and the U.S.A. Experiential education founded by the American John Dewey, and experimental psychology and pedagogy proposed by the German Wilhelm Maximilian Wundt were well known all over the world. An interesting example in this respect is the work *Beobachtungen*

auf dem Gebiete der Pädagogik (Observations in the field of pedagogy; 1870) by Hermann von Westermann, faculty member of the Riga Polytechnic (Riga Polytechnical Institute), where it was stated that in pedagogy it was possible to use the same research methods as in natural sciences and to conduct research in a similar way to that of observing the stars (Zigmunde, 2008, p. 73).

The variety of research tools for studying the child, his development and education resulted in the idea to use all of them together so as to achieve the best result. Obviously, this research arsenal required one common denomination. In 1893, the American scientist Oscar Chrisman came up with the term 'pedology'. Pedology was the study strongly based on positivism: it used the research methods of various sciences – observation, measurements, and psychological experiments – in order to clarify the biological, psychological and social laws determining child's behaviour. Pedology attempted to encompass various sciences, the leading ones being biology, psychology, and sociology. By means of these sciences, pedologists hoped to finally obtain perfect knowledge about the child which could be used in educational practices as well. Pedology experienced the peak of its popularity in Western Europe from 1890 to 1914: in 1909, a Pedological Society was organised; in 1911, the first and the last World Congress in Pedology was held in Brussels with participants from 22 countries. Unfortunately, this promising endeavour was a failure: it turned out that it was not possible to integrate the methods of various sciences together in one uniform model (Depaepe, 1987; 1992; 2002). The successfully developed educational psychology turned out to be the most valuable contribution of pedology to pedagogy.

It should be noted that pedology was popular in Soviet Russia until the mid-1930s, and the famous psychologist Lev Vygotsky was one of its most prominent supporters. However, soon Stalin declared pedology to be a pseudoscience which exaggerated the importance of inheritance and the environment, thus creating advantages for the children of intellectuals rather than the working class. Pedology was banned and severely criticised during the entire Soviet period (see, e.g., Il'ina, 1971, pp. 34–35).

In Latvia, pedology was recognised as one of the basic disciplines in pedagogy in the 1920s by the educators Kārlis Dēķens (1919, p. 4) and Krišs Melnalksnis (1920, pp. 193–195), both sharing left-wing political views, but their ideas did not gain wider popularity.

In 1919, pedagogical research methodologies became the focus of serious academic discussion for the first time in Latvia when professors of pedagogy

were elected at the newly established University of Latvia. Although in the 1920s and 1930s extensive studies were carried out in the field of experimental psychology in Latvia, there were no reverberations from them in pedagogy inside the walls of the University of Latvia.

Following the German traditions of the humanities pedagogy (*geisteswissenschaftliche Pädagogik*), reflections on the ideas of ancient and modern thinkers concerning pedagogy, psychology and philosophy were considered to be the main research method in pedagogy. Even though empirical methods were also mentioned in research papers, professors did not give any convincing guidelines about their application. Professor Kauliņš, for instance, wrote that

the accuracy of statements and postulates clearly has to be proved, and it can be proved convincingly by analyzing, comparing, grouping, and generalizing different observations, facts and abilities both from the intentional and unintentional process of upbringing, i.e. by subjecting them to extensive, slow scientific research work (Kauliņa vēstule..., 1938, p. 128).

According to Professor Dauge, it is easy to be objective in exact sciences where purely neutral things like $2 \times 2 = 4$ are studied; there “we can be bloodless creatures without any temperament”, while “in the matters concerning human life, absolute objectivity is impossible” (Dauge, 1932, p. 2). Professor Jurevičs pointed out that pedagogy cannot be classified either in the category of purely empirical sciences or among purely philosophical studies; its position is in between them, “it is based on certain specific abilities in order to direct upbringing to certain ideals which have not been fully realized yet” (Jurevičs, 1937, p. 30351).

Along with the development of psychology and sociology in particular, the debate concerning pedagogical research methodologies continued in the world. Since the 1960s and 1970s, along with testing, experiments and observation, such research techniques as surveys, interviewing and case studies, as well as statistical data processing methods, became more widely used in pedagogy (see, e.g., Cohen *et al.*, 2007). Nowadays, these techniques are widely used in pedagogical research in Latvia as well (see, e.g., Špona & Čehlova, 2004), discarding the traditions of the humanities almost completely.

The attractiveness of sociological methodologies in the eyes of educators has been explained by Depaepe (1987) with a certain grain of irony: experiments grant a higher status for psychologists and educationalists themselves – by means

of statistical formulae and impressive tables, psychologists and educationalists surround themselves with the aura of science, thus enhancing their status and competitiveness in the labour market.

The structure and terminology of pedagogy

Just like research methodologies, the notions of pedagogy did not concentrate within the framework of a separate scientific discipline till the second half of the 18th century; they developed within the framework of philosophy and theology. Education practitioners and public figures expressed edifications concerning the upbringing of young people addressed to teachers and parents. A lot of illustrations to this can be found in the history of pedagogy, but one of the most well-known examples in the Baltic States is the speeches by Jānis Cimze (1814–1881), the head of Vidzeme Teacher Training Seminary addressed to prospective teachers and collected by his student Jānis Rinkužs (1938), which are full of pedagogical recommendations and edifications.

Only when pedagogy started disengaging from other sciences and developing into a separate academic discipline did pedagogy try to overcome the gap between the mere coexistence of various separate recommendations referring to educational practice and pedagogical ideas which could be regarded as theories binding everything together in a systematic interrelationship (Böhm, 2004, p. 750). According to several authors (e.g., Depaepe, 2002; Tenorth, 2004), Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776–1841), the professor of Königsberg and Göttingen universities, played an important role in granting pedagogy the status of a scientific discipline; he presented pedagogy as a structured science and pointed out that practising and prospective teachers needed a professional science of pedagogy. His book *Umriss pädagogischer Vorlesungen* (A summary of lectures on pedagogy; Herbart, 1835) is considered one of the first scientific publication in the field of pedagogy.

Universities started offering courses in pedagogy in the 18th century when the first department of pedagogy was established at the University of Halle in 1779. However, systematic courses in pedagogy, separate from those in theology and philosophy, were taught in European universities only starting from the early 20th century. This was closely connected with the expansion of secondary education and the development of teaching profession at a higher level: the determination of knowledge necessary for the teaching profession developed the teacher education and professionalisation, as well as pedagogy as an academic

discipline. Pedagogical knowledge was systematised in a certain model, and the issues concerning terminology became increasingly important. The trivial words of everyday language could no longer express the essence of some issue in a comprehensive way; therefore, the development of new notions started within the framework of pedagogical theory. According to Kron (1999), the knowledge obtained in the process of cognition which is aggregated in a certain system is expressed in words, and these words become notions.

Like in Germany, the development of the structure of pedagogy in Latvia was connected with establishing of pedagogy as an academic discipline in the University of Latvia. The task of developing pedagogy into an academic discipline was undertaken by three professors mentioned above – Jānis Kauliņš (1863–1940), a philologist and educational historian, Aleksandrs Dauge (1868–1937), a historian and pedagogue, and Pauls Jurevičs (1891–1981), a philologist and philosopher, as well as Jūlijs Aleksandrs Students (1898–1964), a faculty member in various teacher training institutions, a philosopher and psychologist. Their views had mainly been formed under the influence of German pedagogical ideas, which can be seen from references in the curricula and publications: for instance, in the book *Vispārīgā paidagoģija. Zinātne un māksla sevis un citu audzināšanā* (General pedagogy. Science and art for developing oneself and others; Students, 1933), Students provides references to 944 works, 885 of which are in German, but only 59 in Latvian, Russian, English, and French. When explaining his pedagogical views in a letter to Professor Jurevičs, Professor Kauliņš admits that they have been formed under the influence of the German authors Ernst Krieck and Nicolai Hartmann, who can be considered as “the main supporters of the science of pedagogy” (*Kauliņa vēstule...*, 1938, p. 129). By the way, references to Krieck’s work *Philosophie der Erziehung* (The philosophy of upbringing; Krieck, 1922) can be found in the works of all leading Latvian pedagogues in the 1920s and 1930s.

According to Latvian pedagogues, the field of pedagogy as a scientific discipline comprised the history of pedagogy, which makes it possible to identify relationships between the phenomena of upbringing and the theory of upbringing (Jurevičs, 1937, p. 30351). The theory of upbringing, in turn, included aesthetic education, social education, economic education, political education, and religious education (Dauge, 1934–1935). Jurevičs and Students added school management to the history of pedagogy and the theory of upbringing; Jurevičs also added didactics. Overall, the model of pedagogy comprising the history of pedagogy, the theory of upbringing, didactics and school management was traditional for Europe in the interwar period, and it constitutes the core of pedagogy as a scientific discipline nowadays as well.

After the Second World War, the borders of pedagogy expanded along with the expansion of pedagogues' scope of activity. The awareness of the fact that pedagogical knowledge was necessary not only in schools but also in the institutions of higher education, interest education, in the army, etc. resulted in the modification of the theoretical model of pedagogy. Along with general pedagogy, there started the development of various branches of pedagogy. Since the 1960s, discussions concerning environmental education, adult education, family education, health education, cross-cultural education, etc. were started in the world (see, e.g., Raithel *et al.*, 2009).

This versatility has also reached Latvia in the last twenty years. Nowadays in Latvia, the theoretical model of pedagogy comprises general pedagogy, including the theory of upbringing and general didactics, social pedagogy, developmental pedagogy, which includes preschool pedagogy, school pedagogy, pedagogy for the institutions of higher education, vocational pedagogy, as well as separate branches of pedagogy including music pedagogy, sport pedagogy, health pedagogy, and environmental pedagogy (Špona & Čehlova, 2004).

The denomination of pedagogy

When the word 'mathematics', 'biology', or 'history' is mentioned, everyone understands what branch of science it refers to. As to human education and upbringing, in contrast, there is no uniform opinion about the name of the science. The terms 'education', 'educational science(s)', 'pedagogy' are used in the English language; two different words '*Pädagogik*' and '*Erziehungswissenschaft*' are used in German; in the French language, three terms coexist with each other: '*pédagogie*', '*science de l'éducation*'/ '*sciences de l'éducation*' (educational science/sciences); the term '*pedagogika*' is used in Russian; '*pedagoogika*' and '*kasvatusteadus*', '*haridusteadus*' (educational sciences) in Estonian; '*pedagogika*' and '*edukologija*' in Lithuanian; '*pedagogija*' and '*izglītības zinātne/zinātnes*' (educational science/sciences) in the Latvian language. According to Hofstetter and Schneuwly, this diversity of denominations reflects the diversity of views and lack of clarity with regard to the content of pedagogy: "This diversity is in itself an index for the fact that the field is characterised by unclear contours, by permeable boundaries, by a variable structure, by an uncertain continuity, by contrasted configuration" (Hofstetter & Schneuwly, 2003, p. 55). This also relates to Kron's (1999) statement that by creating notions with the help of definitions a research object is revealed and made more exact.

Pedagogy, however, lacks such uniform definition; different terms referring to the field of educational science have developed separately depending on the cultural, geographical and historical context.

Already at the very beginnings of the development of pedagogy, two different domains could be distinguished: educational practice and theoretical reflections on this practice. The key role of theories was to help develop the educational practice and to improve it. One of the first attempts to reflect this dual situation and to find a proper name for educational theory can be found in Germany. In the second half of the 18th century, the term ‘pedagogy’ was used in the territory of Germany; the etymology of the term described in the literature written in English, German, Russian, and Latvian languages links it with the Greek word *paidagogós*, which originally referred to a slave who accompanied a child in his daily activities; for instance, he had to take him to school and back home. The original meaning of the word – “leading the child” – gradually transformed into a more general meaning ‘child-instruction’ (Hobmair, 2008; Drosdowski, 1989). Böhm (2004, p. 750) disagrees with this widely known etymology of the word ‘pedagogy’; he believes that the foreign word ‘pedagogy’, which was used as a term referring to a new science, appeared in Germany only around the year 1770, and it has not been derived from the Ancient Greek word *paidagogós*, but has been created from the Greek word *paideia* – ‘instruction, education’; thus, it refers to “instruction and the theory concerning human education and upbringing”, and the word has nothing to do with slavery.

Along with the word ‘pedagogy’, the term ‘the science of upbringing’ (*Erziehungswissenschaft*) also appeared in Germany almost at the same time; the first evidence about it refers to the year 1766 (Tenorth, 2004, p. 341). Initially, the term ‘pedagogy’ was a common denomination for everything related to educational practices. However, when pedagogy developed into an independent scientific discipline, there appeared a need for a notion that would refer to the scientific interpretation of the reality of upbringing (Hobmair, 2008, pp. 12–13). Thus the term ‘the science of upbringing’ was introduced in Germany, which is also referred to as ‘scientific pedagogy’ by the pedagogy researcher Tenorth (2004, p. 341).

The diversity of views about the denomination of pedagogy existed in Germany both in the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century; frequently, the same author used both terms as synonyms referring to the educational science. It is difficult to find a common denominator in this diverse use of terminology, but there can be observed a trend that the term ‘the science of upbringing’ was preferred by the representatives of teachers’ movement; it was also used in the

pedagogy guided by the Catholic Church and by the theoreticians of National Socialism in the 1930s. The term ‘pedagogy’, on the other hand, was more often used referring to philosophy or the humanities, as well as referring to the whole field in general as part of the system of sciences. The functional equivalence of both terms was often emphasised in lexicons giving the reference “see ‘pedagogy’” at the entry of the term ‘the science of upbringing’ or not isolating the term ‘the science of upbringing’ as a separate entry at all, but explaining it together with the term ‘pedagogy’ (Tenorth, 2004). Discussions concerning both terms continued in Germany also in the second half of the 20th century. In the professional literature written in the German language, both terms – ‘pedagogy’ and ‘the science of upbringing’ – are still used as synonyms quite often.

In the territory of Latvia, the term ‘pedagogy’ started to be used along with the beginnings of the professional education of teachers. As this field was the intersection between the interests of German landed gentry and Russian civil servants, the influence of both German and Russian cultures in the choice of terminology can be traced. For instance, in the year 1879, the syllabus of the Vidzeme Teacher Training Seminary, where instruction was offered in German, contained the term ‘*Die Schulkunde*’ (*Lehrplan...*, 1879, p. 15), which could be translated as ‘Studies about school’. On the other hand, the curricula of the Baltic Teacher Training Seminary and women’s gymnasiums, where instruction was offered in Russian, included the subject Pedagogy (*Pedagogika*) in the early 20th century (*Otchet...*, 1874, p. 5; Tomāss, 1940, p. 100). At the beginning of the 20th century, the term ‘pedagogy’ was used both in the curriculum of the Jelgava German Teacher Training Seminary (*Deutsches...*, p. 12) and in the curricula and syllabi of teacher training seminaries where instruction was offered in Russian (Fal’bork & Charnoluskii, 1901, p. 42). The words ‘*Pedagoģija*’, ‘*paidagoģija*’, ‘*paidagoģika*’ or ‘*pedagoģika*’ found their stable place in the Latvian language in the following decades, while the term ‘the science of upbringing’ (*audzināšanas zinātne*), so widespread in Germany, was used as a direct translation into Latvian in only few publications (e.g., Dauge, 1925).

At the same time, in the 1920s and the 1930s, the idea about two different terms referring to pedagogy arose in Latvia in order to distinguish its practical and theoretical aspects. One of the proponents of this idea was the abovementioned Professor Kauliņš (1924, pp. 42–78) at the University of Latvia. He believed that ‘*pedagoģika*’ and ‘*pedagoģija*’ would be the appropriate terms in the Latvian language. The former would refer to educational theory, the latter – to practical activity. Kauliņš used a comparison with surgery, which is based on anatomy and physiology, with farming, which is based on chemistry, and with

judge's practice, which is based on law. According to Kauliņš, pedagogy as an aggregate of practical knowledge originated at the dawn of civilisation, but it is still new as a scientific discipline, and it has to make itself free from the bondage of religion and philosophy. Kauliņš's view about the use of two different terms was supported by his colleague Professor Jurevičs: "pedagogy as theory and reflection has to be separated from upbringing as the action which this reflection is focused on" (Jurevičs, 1937, pp. 30348–30349); however, further in the text Jurevičs doubted himself whether it would be possible to set apart theory and practice so strictly. Nevertheless, neither Kauliņš's nor Jurevičs' view gained wider support, so Latvian pedagogues continued using the term '*pedagoģija*', including different content into it at different times.

As it was mentioned above, during the decades various practical and research directions developed within the framework of the field of pedagogy (adult education, environmental education, etc.). Most of the countries, including Latvia, have decided to put all this diversity under the umbrella term 'pedagogical/educational sciences'. Nevertheless, the term 'pedagogy' still remains to be popular in Europe, and, according to the university study programmes published on the Internet, it is used in German, French, Spanish, Dutch, Polish, Estonian, Lithuanian, Latvian and other languages. A question still remains: what is understood by this term in each country? It still remains a topic for discussion just like the structure of pedagogy and its research methodologies.

A few conclusions

Although pedagogy as a scientific discipline – a "child" of the Enlightenment – is still considered to be one of the newest branches of science, it has taken it almost 300 hundred years to continue its difficult journey aimed at developing theoretical models and valid research methodologies.

As this study has shown, pedagogy has been emancipated from theology and philosophy, its "mother sciences", and it has been regarded as an independent scientific discipline since the end of the 18th century: it is taught at universities, and it has its own system of creating scientific knowledge. On the other hand, nowadays with the expansion of the field of pedagogy beyond the family and school and encompassing the life of the entire human society, pedagogy finds itself in close interrelationship with other branches of science once again – with psychology, sociology, and history, in particular. The debate of its position among other sciences is still ongoing, and the borders of the field are quite

blurred, which, according to Hofstetter and Schneuwly (2003), is also reflected in the diversity of the terms referring to pedagogy. A valid question to be raised is whether nowadays, with interdisciplinary studies becoming increasingly popular, are there many scientific disciplines with a strict and definite field left? Possibly, the amorphousness of the field of pedagogy is not a drawback; on the contrary, it gives an opportunity to use the achievements of other sciences in order to tackle pedagogical problems.

Pedagogy originated as part of the humanities, but it continued its development both within the paradigm of the humanities and natural sciences. Nowadays, it is developing as a social science using research methodologies characteristic of social sciences, which are attractive and offer a certain guarantee that research would be objective. At the same time it should be taken into account that a complete renunciation of the research traditions of the humanities can impoverish the further development of pedagogical theory.

References

- Böhm, W.** (2004), 'Pädagogik.' *Historisches Wörterbuch der Pädagogik*, Weinheim & Basel: Beltz Verlag, pp. 750–782.
- Cohen, L.; Manion, L. & Morrison, K.** (2007), *Research Methods in Education*, 6th edition, London & New York: Routledge.
- Dauge, A.** (1925), 'Audzināšanas zinātne un audzināšanas māksla.' *Audzinātājs*, nos. 1–2.
- (1934–1935), 'Programma vispārīgā paidagoģijā LU. 1934.–35. gads.' [Archive material; in Latvian] LVVA, F 7427, d 6, f 63.l, Latvian State Historical Archives, Riga.
- [Dauge, A.]** (1932), *Vispārīgā paidagoģija. (Latvijas Īniversitātē lasāmo lekciju kurss)*, [Manuscript in Latvian].
- Dēķens, K.** (1919), *Rokas grāmata pedagogijā*. [In Latvian] Rīga: Izglītības kooperatīva 'Kultūras balss' apgādībā.
- Depaepe, M.** (1987), 'Social and personal factors in the inception of experimental research in education (1890–1914): An exploratory study.' *History of Education*, 1987, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 275–298.
- (1992), 'Experimental Research in Education, 1890–1940: Historical Process behind the Development of a Discipline in Western Europe and the United States.' In M. Whitehead (ed.) *Education and Europe: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, Hull: University of Hull, Studies in Education Ltd., pp. 67–93.

- (2002), 'The Practical and Professional Relevance of Educational Research and Pedagogical Knowledge from the Perspective of History: reflections on the Belgian case in its international background.' *European Educational Research Journal*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 360–379.
- Deutsches Lehrerseminar zu Mitau. Bericht über das I Quadrennium (1907/8–1910/11)*, Riga: Buch u. Steindruckerei A. Von Grotuss.
- Drosdowski, G.** (1989), *Duden 'Etymologie' Herkunftswörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 2., völlig neu bearbeitet und erweitert Auflage. Band 7, Mannheim & Wien: Dudenverlag.
- Fal'bork, G. & Charnoluskii V.**, eds. (1901), *Uchitel'skie seminarii i shkoly: Sistematičeskii svod zakonov*. S-Peterburg: Tipo-Litografija B. M. Vol'fa.
- Herbart, J. F.** (1835), *Umriss pädagogischer Vorlesungen*. Göttingen: In der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung.
- Hobmair, H.** (2008), *Pädagogik*. Troisdorf: Bildungsverlag EINS GmbH.
- Hofstetter, R. & Schneuwly, B.** (2003), 'A way for doing history of education sciences (end of 19th–first half of 20th century): The study of the disciplinarization process and of its contrasting configurations.' In *Research Community. Philosophy and History of the Discipline of Education. Evaluation and Evolution of the Criteria for Educational Research*, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Leuven, pp. 53–65.
- Il'ina, T.** (1971), *Pedagoģija*. [In Latvian] Rīga: Zvaigzne.
- Jurevičs, P.** (1937), 'Paidagōģija.' [In Latvian] In *Latviešu konversācijas vārdnīca*, 15. sēj., Rīga: Grāmatu apgādniecība A. Gulbis, pp. 30348–30351.
- Kauliņš, J.** (1924), 'Herbarts.' [In Latvian] In *Tautas audzināšana*, Riga, pp. 42–78.
- Kauliņa vēstule Jurēvičam* (1938), [Archive material] LVVA, F 7427, d 13, f 719.1, pp. 128–129, Latvian State Historical Archives, Riga.
- Krieck, E.** (1922), *Philosophie der Erziehung*, Jena: Eugen Diederichs.
- Kron, F. W.** (1999), *Wissenschaftstheorie für Pädagogen*, München & Basel: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag.
- (2001), *Grundwissen Pädagogik*. 6., überarbeitete Auflage, München & Basel: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag.
- Krūze, A.; Ķestere, I.; Sirk, V. & Tijūneliēne, O.**, eds. (2009), *History of Education and Pedagogical Thought in the Baltic Countries up to 1940: An Overview*, Riga: RaKa.
- Lehrplan für das Parochiallehrer-Seminar zu Walk* (1879), Riga den 7 Mai 1879. Riga: Alex Stahl.
- Löwisch, D. J.** (2002), *Wilhelm Dilthey 'Grundlinien eines Systems der Pädagogik' und 'Über die Möglichkeit einer allgemeingültigen pädagogischen Wissenschaft'*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Melnalksnis, K.** (1920), 'Darbā stājoties. Ko pedagoģijas zinātne prasa no skolotāja.' [In Latvian] *Izglītības Ministrijas Mēnešraksts*, no. 9, pp. 193–195.

- Otchet o sostoianii Rizhskoi zhenskoj Lomonosovskoi gimnazii* (1874), Report on the status of the Riga women's Lomonosov gymnasium [In Russian], Riga: tipografija A. I. Lipinskago.
- Raithel, J.; Dollinger, B. & Hörmann, G.** (2009), *Einführung. Pädagogik. Begriffe. Strömungen. Klassiker. Fachrichtungen*, 3. Auflage, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Rinkužs, K.** (1938), *Jānis Cimze*, [In Latvian] Rīga: Valters un Rapa.
- Students, J. A.** (1933), *Vispārīgā paidagoģija*, [In Latvian] Rīga: Fr. Baumaņa apg.
- Schmid, P.** (2006), 'Pädagogik im Zeitalter der Aufklärung.' In K. Harney & H-H. Krüger (eds.) *Einführung in die Geschichte der Erziehungswissenschaft und Erziehungswirklichkeit*. 3., erweiterte und aktualisierte Auflage, Opladen & Bloomfield: Verlag Barbara Budrich, pp. 15–36.
- Špona, A. & Čehlova, Z.** (2004), *Pētniecība pedagoģijā*. [In Latvian] Rīga: RaKa.
- Tenorth, H-E.** (2004), 'Erziehungswissenschaft.' In D. Benner & J. Oelker (eds.) *Historisches Wörterbuch der Pädagogik*, Weinheim & Basel: Beltz Verlag, pp. 341–382.
- Terhart, E.** (2004), 'Lehrer.' In D. Benner & J. Oelker (eds.) *Historisches Wörterbuch der Pädagogik*, Weinheim & Basel: Beltz Verlag, pp. 548–564.
- Tomāss, E.,** ed. (1940), *Baltijas skolotāju seminārs 1870–1919*. [In Latvian] Rīga: Baltijas skolotāju semināra audzēkņu un skolotāju biedrība.
- Tschamler, H.** (1983), *Wissenschaftstheorie. Eine Einführung für Pädagogen*, Bad Heilbrunn/Obb.: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt.
- Vedins, I.** (2008), *Zinātne un patiesība*, [In Latvian] Rīga: Avots.
- Wahrig-Burfeind, R.** (2006), *Wahrig Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Gütersloh & München: Wissen Media Verlag GmbH, p. 1666.
- Zigmunde, A.** (2008), *Pedagoģiskā darbība Rīgas politehnikumā un Rīgas Politehniskajā institūtā (1862–1919)* [In Latvian] Rīga: RaKa.