



Encyclopaedia of Ukrainian education in the independence era: A thesaurus of theory, practice, and personalities

Mykola Stepanenko*

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine
03041, 15 Heroiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6727-1265>

Nina Stepanenko

PhD in Philological Sciences, Associate Professor
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine
03041, 15 Heroiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0934-784X>

Abstract. The relevance of this study stemmed from the need for a comprehensive examination of the terminological and conceptual framework of pedagogy, based on the principles of classical and modern encyclopaedics. The article aimed to provide an in-depth analysis of the most authoritative contemporary encyclopaedic publications, assessed regarding encyclopaedic standards, structural content, Ukrainian-centred perspectives, and alignment with European traditions. Appropriate theoretical, empirical-theoretical, and empirical methods have been employed to conduct a thorough study of the body of pedagogical knowledge through the lens of its terminological and conceptual apparatus and precedent figures, with a preference for methods such as definition analysis, content analysis, comparative analysis, and classification. The study offered a multifaceted examination of the processes of nomination, lexicography, and terminography of scientific denotations, integrating the criterion of “pedagogical and educational realities”. The research focused on landmark encyclopaedic publications within a clearly defined chronological scope – namely, the late 20th and early 21st centuries (the independence era). The subject of analysis included the Ukrainian pedagogical dictionary and Ukrainian pedagogical encyclopaedic dictionary by S.U. Honcharenko, Pedagogical Dictionary edited by M.D. Yarmachenko, the first and second editions of the collective work Encyclopaedia of Education by the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, and the draft of The Great Encyclopaedia. A thematic index of entries within the field of Pedagogical Sciences has been developed, structuring

Received 22.07.2024 Revised 30.10.2024 Accepted 27.11.2024

Suggested Citation:

Stepanenko, M., & Stepanenko, N. (2024). Encyclopaedia of Ukrainian education in the independence era: A thesaurus of theory, practice, and personalities. *Humanities Studios: Pedagogy, Psychology, Philosophy*, 12(4), 9-22. doi: 10.31548/hspedagog/4.2024.9.

*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

a “genealogical tree of concepts” through content-rich thematic groups that represent Pedagogical Sciences in the Great Universal Encyclopaedia. An attempt has been made to classify the examined encyclopaedic content by identifying the most typical models based on unifying markers such as “specialised publication”, “regional publication”, “personal publication”, and “encyclopaedic publication proper”. The study has been conducted through a synchronic-diachronic lens, with a focus on a compendium of knowledge concerning cultivated pedagogical and educational terminology, as well as notable figures representing various dimensions of pedagogy and education. The specificity of the selected works, the definitional standards of the entries, and their relevant characteristics have been thoroughly interpreted, considering the balance between encyclopaedic universality and the idiosyncratic stylistic features of individual publications and the broader context. A comparative analysis of the publications has been undertaken to provide a comprehensive characterisation of the dynamic processes within the pedagogical and educational terminological-conceptual system, viewed against the backdrop of national and global scholarly and historical-cultural developments. The findings of this study may be applied in encyclopaedography, terminography, and the teaching of pedagogical subjects

Keywords: educational sphere; pedagogical encyclopaedic publications; terminological-conceptual framework; pedagogical dictionary; pedagogical sciences

Introduction

One of the most telling indicators of a society's development and prestige is the level of its encyclopaedic endeavours. Encyclopaedias, as the most systematic bearers of information, have not only retained their significance since their inception over 600 years ago but have actually grown in importance. An encyclopaedic boom, whether on a national or global scale, always plays a positive role, as it deepens understanding and propels society towards new intellectual and spiritual horizons. Interest in encyclopaedics, encyclopaediography, and encyclopaedic content is constant, driven by a multitude of factors, primarily the evolution of the multifunctional encyclopaedic paradigm. This paradigm incorporates pedagogical knowledge with a broad range of content, as well as traditional and modern technologies and production methods. The formation of this socially significant discourse, represented by encyclopaedic and linguistic compendia of knowledge, is an ongoing process influenced by linguistic and extralinguistic factors such as economic, political, ideological, and cultural conditions. This process is primarily influenced by the overall progress of science and the development of both established

and newly emerging fields of study. Moreover, it is significantly determined by the dynamics of the language situation, including the struggle between archaic stereotypes and new trends in language planning and development, changes in language policy and legislation, and linguistic migration phenomena. The latter refers to instances where one language substantially influences another with more advanced encyclopaedic traditions, a more systematic and comprehensive structure of terms, and concepts.

Ukrainian encyclopaedics and lexicography have followed a distinctive path of development, characterised by their unique national features. Pedagogical science, with its specific terminology and conceptual apparatus, is no exception. The origins of educational and pedagogical encyclopaedics can be traced back to ancient times. The formation of a multi-genre terminological system on a national basis, which intensified in the late 19th and early 20th centuries with the establishment of the Institute of the Ukrainian Scientific Language (and its pedagogicalpsychological section), remains ongoing. This process has become even more acute in the last decade due to the dynamic

sociolinguistic situation, marked by a decline in the prestige of the Russian language and a significant weakening of its functional activity in the context of the fullscale Russian-Ukrainian war. The focus is primarily on developing a national encyclopaedic framework, which is shaped by several key factors. Firstly, it involves the organisation of pedagogical terminology according to various criteria, structured within hypernym-hyponym relationships. Secondly, it requires refining the internal differentiation and integration of this terminology into a coherent system. Thirdly, it entails the compilation of a register of precedentsetting figures in the field.

The societal priorities reflected in pedagogical theory and practice are evident in the fact that pedagogical terminology has become an integral part of various specialised and universal encyclopaedias, dictionaries, reference dictionaries, and handbooks in fields such as philosophy, psychology, medicine, politics, and political science. Conversely, pedagogy itself is in constant interaction with the conceptual apparatus of other sciences, continuously incorporating terms and concepts from newly emerging fields such as andragogy, biblical pedagogy, military pedagogy, embryonic pedagogy, ethnic pedagogy, integral pedagogy, Cossack pedagogy, museum pedagogy, neo-pedagogy, pedagogy of good, pedagogy of peace, pedagogy of work, developmental pedagogy, environmental pedagogy, penitentiary pedagogy, preventive pedagogy, prenatal pedagogy, social pedagogy, and theatrical pedagogy, among others. Given these factors, it is essential to address the issue of encyclopaedisation within Ukrainian pedagogy and education in a broad sense – from national to European and global theoretical and practical entities, and from Ukrainian personalities to those at the European and global level. Equally important is the task of systematising pedagogical terminology.

Researchers are actively engaged in exploring criteria for typological differentiation of encyclopaedias, including electronic publications, and conducting systematic analyses of pedagogical terminology using various classification parameters through a synchronic and diachronic

lens, with a particular emphasis on contemporary developments. M. Zhelezniak *et al.* (2021) have conducted extensive research on the first problem, proposing to distinguish between: 1) universal, sectoral, specialised, and regional editions – based on the nature of information; 2) scientific, popular science, and popular editions – based on their intended purpose; 3) alphabetical, systematic, and alphabetical-systematic publications – based on their structure; 4) publications aimed at the general public, specific specialists, youth, and children – based on the target audience. The most productive category is publications based on the criterion of “different types of information”, such as: “specialised + personal”, “sectoral + personal”, “specialised + regional”, “sectoral + regional”, “specialised + regional + personal”, “sectoral + regional + personal”, and so on. It is essential, however, to consider several fundamental aspects: 1) all types of encyclopaedias are a specific form of literature that “reflects the culture of universal knowledge, its organisation and systematisation on the one hand, and its preservation and dissemination on the other”; 2) encyclopaedias are “more than just books; they are a form and means of universal knowledge, a distinct phenomenon in the sphere of knowledge, and their development in world culture; a special way of thinking that involves the generalisation, systematisation, and comparison of knowledge” (Ishchenko & Stepanenko, 2024).

The role of electronic encyclopaedias is a pressing issue in contemporary research. Scholars such as A. Yatsyshyn *et al.* (2021) emphasise the need to study and generalise international experiences in creating such works. They categorise electronic encyclopaedias into two types: 1) those “created by adapting print encyclopaedias for web-based environments” and 2) those “created not by publishers but by readers (according to the rules of each project)”. Researchers V. Bykov *et al.* (2022) convincingly argue for the significance of web-based encyclopaedic publications, highlighting their role in preserving the heritage of national pedagogy, popularising science, and disseminating scientific information.

The integration of these modern information carriers into educational settings is another pressing issue (Dashko, 2023). Electronic encyclopaedias offer promising and convenient didactic tools, as they “provide significant opportunities for successful learning, emphasise the most important aspects of a learning topic, create conditions for systematising and generalising information, and ultimately contribute to active engagement in independent work, capable of stimulating students’ interest in learning and increasing their overall motivation” (Zhelezniak, 2020).

In the era of independence, the issue of forming a terminological resource has become exceptionally acute. Scholars such as A. Gurzhiy *et al.* (2022) and A. Yatsyshyn (2023) rightly emphasise that the active processes driven by globalisation and the exponential growth of scientific data in the 21st century have led to trends toward the universalisation of intellectual life. As a result, the terminological and conceptual apparatus is undergoing constant transformation, with new terms emerging and their definitions undergoing significant changes and periodic refinements. Consequently, “there is a clear need to address the problem of forming, systematising, unifying, and updating the conceptual and terminological apparatus of all fields of knowledge, including psychological and pedagogical sciences”. Another important research area is the expansion of the terminological corpus on a national basis, which occurs in two ways: 1) the creation of new terms and concepts based on national foundations and 2) the return to active use of native terminology that was previously excluded from scientific discourse for various reasons, primarily ideological. This process is characterised by two trends: 1) the displacement of borrowed terms and concepts and their replacement with native Ukrainian equivalents and 2) competition between borrowed and native terms and concepts, resulting in the replenishment of the latter with terminological units that function as alternative or exclusive norms.

Within the scholarly discourse on this topic, it is crucial to highlight the contributions of

researchers who have outlined the prospects for the encyclopaedisation of education. Valuable insights are provided regarding the content, structure of categorical and conceptual apparatus, and criteria for selecting entries. T. Filimonova (2020) suggests creating a thematic register of entries in the field of Pedagogical Sciences based on the criteria of “frequency and stability of use”, “relevance”, and “explanatory potential”, which are specific instances of the broader strategies of “general-specific” and “more important-less important”. S. Lapaienko (2021), characterising the factual nature and multifaceted nature of psychological and pedagogical knowledge, as well as the categorisation and systematisation of informational and reference material for a comprehensive understanding of the studied segment of entries, clearly pragmatises and substantiates the aforementioned conceptual foundation, lending it credibility. Regarding the interpretation of the encyclopaedic rank of the analysed works, this important aspect of encyclopaedics, encyclopaediography, and lexicography has not yet been subjected to close scrutiny by researchers. This article aimed to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the genre, content, and definitional structure of recent publications with classical markers of encyclopaedic quality, which, through the system of naming pedagogical and educational realities and characterising pedagogical personalities, reflect the state of development of Ukrainian pedagogical science, educational progress, and societal development as a whole.

Materials and Methods

At the initial stage of the study, a descriptive method was employed to organise the material, systematically catalogue encyclopaedic publications, and establish the terminological corpus of a given study from synchronic-diachronic, traditional-innovative, and structural-functional perspectives, among others. The methods of comprehensive sampling and definition analysis were used to determine the classification of terms within the field of pedagogy in general and

specific subdomains in particular. The second and most critical stage involved a series of interconnected, multi-tiered methods, among which the following were of particular significance: content analysis – to develop the theoretical foundations, justify the strategic conceptual principles of the proposed scholarly discourse, and refine the terminology for denoting both traditional and modern pedagogical realities; comparative-contrastive method – to analyse the content and structural features of identical terms across different scholarly discourses by the same or different authors; comparative method – to compare the essence of the studied terms and concepts, determining their place and role in the formation of the Ukrainian conceptual-terminological paradigm; componential analysis – to establish the hierarchical rank of a scientific denotatum and assess its status; classification method – to identify and group terms and concepts according to specified criteria; definitional method – to interpret the definitional standard of an encyclopaedic entry. The research procedure was concluded with the application of quantitative methods, which enabled the identification of the mechanisms driving dynamic changes in pedagogy, influenced by the development of both Ukrainian and global scholarship. These methods facilitated a comprehensive analysis of the process of updating the pedagogical content of a given encyclopaedic publication, improving the methodology for defining entries, and standardising the conceptual-terminological framework.

This study employed a combination of scientific and general research methods, including analysis, synthesis, induction, and deduction, to systematically examine the characteristics and content of several pedagogical encyclopaedias. These methods have been widely recognised as effective tools for systematically reflecting on the laws of the objective world. Using this methodological framework, the study comprehensively characterised the content, structural specificity, and popularity of the following encyclopaedias: Ukrainian Pedagogical Dictionary by

S. Honcharenko (1997), Ukrainian Pedagogical Encyclopaedic Dictionary by S. Honcharenko (2011), Pedagogical Dictionary edited by M. Yarmachenko (2001), and two editions of the Encyclopaedia of Education (Kremen, 2008; Kremen *et al.*, 2021). Additionally, the study analysed The Great Encyclopaedia. Thematic Register of Slogans in the Field of Pedagogical Sciences (Kyrydon, 2020) in comparison to the others. The findings indicate that, except for the latter, which is presented as a project for a future fundamental encyclopaedia, these publications most adequately meet the canons of encyclopaedias. They effectively demonstrate “activity directed at the creation of knowledge” (Pylypenko & Fedorova, 2020), conveying knowledge from the specific field of pedagogy and related disciplines. This involves interdisciplinary approaches and methods of cognition that “arise at the intersection of different scientific disciplines”, serving as “a progressive tool for obtaining new knowledge” and reflecting “the understanding of science as a qualitatively new type of communicative tool” (Ishchenko & Stepanenko, 2024). This trend is recognised, supported, and expanded upon by the progressive world.

Results and Discussion

Typology and classification of encyclopaedic editions on pedagogy and education in the era of independence

It is worth reiterating that “the presence of encyclopaedic publications in various fields of science, technology, culture, and the national economy is a sign of a nation’s level of education, intellectual development, and readiness for independent statehood” (Honcharenko, 2011). It is also important to emphasise the existence of various approaches to classifying encyclopaedic publications and the technology of preparing their content, which is characterised by “two interconnected and relatively opposite processes: tradition and innovation”, where “in both cases, scientists use postulates in the form of a terminological system in a complex metalinguistic environment of conceptual definitions” of pedagogy as a

science (Ivanytska, 2017). This refers to the preservation and development of specific terminology, “the definition of new lexical elements and their interpretation at the current stage of social development, and a fundamentally new interpretation of familiar words in the context of educational reform and the country’s European integration” (Serebrianska, 2019).

Another type of specific encyclopaedic representatives emerges when using the classification scheme proposed by N. Chernysh (2015), which, based on the criterion of “target purpose”, distinguishes three types of encyclopaedias: scientific, popular-scientific, and practical. A closer analysis reveals that a definitive classification of the analysed works within these categories has yet to be established. A positive aspect to highlight is the gradual disappearance of the ethnically indistinct practice of encyclopaedia compilation, lexicography, and terminography. Ukrainian authors who have studied the historical-pedagogical aspects of the Ukrainian terminological system “have not clearly distinguished between Russian authors, Russian/Soviet terminology, and Ukrainian ones, which would have brought their own understanding to the content of the concepts under consideration” (Sukhomlynska, 2021). Furthermore, the integration of powerful search functions, electronic catalogues, video, animation, and other modern technologies into encyclopaedias is a significant achievement (Usyk & Astapov, 2011). Complementing these modern encyclopaedic standards is the need to align the compendium of knowledge with the level of perception of the contemporary, discerning recipient, including their aesthetic, ethical, axiological, pragmatic views, beliefs, and preferences (Trishchuk, 2018).

The pedagogical and educational continuum of knowledge is represented in all the types of encyclopaedic publications discussed above. This highlights a significant trend: “many pedagogical phenomena and laws have an interdisciplinary character”. Therefore, “the pedagogical terminological system should be considered as a set of concepts from pedagogy and related fields such

as psychology, philosophy, physiology, medicine, informatics, sociology, political science, and so on”, where “only the pedagogical meaning should be highlighted in terms that belong to other fields of science” (Honcharuk, 2009). The most common type of work for the analysed chronological period is characterised by a syncretic nature with multi-vector informational components. The first type is clearly demonstrated by specialised pedagogical encyclopaedic publications of pedagogical terms (Semenova, 2006; Krutii & Funtikova, 2010; Lukianova & Anishchenko, 2017). The second type is explicitly represented by specialised, regional, and personal studies (Prokopenko & Lozova, 1994; Bilousko, 2017). The third type is formed by pedagogical encyclopaedic works, which are the focus of this article.

This study focused on a group of publications that, through their content and terminological framework, reflect the dynamics of Ukrainian pedagogical science in a retrospective and modern context. These publications include the Encyclopaedia of Education (Kremen, 2008; Kremen *et al.*, 2021), the Ukrainian Pedagogical Dictionary (1st edition) and the Ukrainian Pedagogical Encyclopaedic Dictionary (2nd edition) by S. Honcharenko (1997; 2011), and the Pedagogical Dictionary edited by M. Yarmachenko (2001). Furthermore, the study considered the future potential of the Great Universal Encyclopaedia (The Great Encyclopaedia. Thematic Register of Slogans in the Field of Pedagogical Sciences) (Kyrydon, 2020). It is noteworthy that the titles of two of these publications include the lexemes “encyclopaedia” and “encyclopaedic”, which serve as semantic constants and clear linguistic markers of their status as encyclopaedic editions.

The Ukrainian Pedagogical Dictionary and Ukrainian Pedagogical Encyclopaedic Dictionary by S. Honcharenko, and the Pedagogical Dictionary edited by M. Yarmachenko

It is important to highlight that the Ukrainian Pedagogical Dictionary by S. Honcharenko (1997) is the earliest work in the analysed encyclopaedic

context. According to the author, its purpose was “on the one hand, to initiate a systematic scientific work on Ukrainian pedagogical terminology, to enrich it, and to bring it into line with the terminology accepted in developed countries, and on the other hand, to provide a large number of scientists, teachers, and other education workers with a reference encyclopaedic publication that summarises and systematises a fairly complete body of information on the theory, history, and practice of teaching and education”. Based on the criterion of “nature of information”, this dictionary, along with the subsequent one, can be classified as multidisciplinary-personal encyclopaedic works, as they include, in addition to pedagogical terms and concepts, terms and concepts from related sciences such as philosophy, psychology, medicine, and informatics, as well as personalities selected based on their “level of achievement as an educator or scientist in the field of education and pedagogical science, and the positive evaluation of their work by the public” (Honcharenko, 2011). A distinctive feature of this work is that all entries are presented without references to sources, indicating a more complex and demanding approach to structuring the entry – authorial interpretation. The length of the entries varies, determined by the significance of the term or concept and its status within the terminological paradigm. The absence of strict uniformity is noteworthy and has its advantages, as it allows for the identification and appropriate interpretation of the inherent characteristics of the publication and the author’s idiosyncratic style.

The Ukrainian Pedagogical Dictionary shares similarities with the Ukrainian Pedagogical Encyclopaedic Dictionary in that both include “a generalised and systematised overview of the theory and practice of teaching and education” (Kremen, 2008; Kremen, *et al.*, 2021), with the main distinction being the amount of information, or more specifically, the number of entries (around 3,000 in the first edition and 4,000 in the second). This is clearly demonstrated by a comparative analysis of the entries under the letter

“A” (English: A): 198 entries in 1997 and 230 in 2011, and under the letter “Я” (English: Y): 13 entries in 1997 and 19 in 2011. Some biblionyms have been clarified (“Algebra” → “Algebra and the Fundamentals of Analysis”; “Certification of Educational Workers” → “Certification of Scientific and Pedagogical Workers”, etc.), and new entries have been introduced (“Art therapy”, “Avant-garde”, “Accommodation”, “Axiom”, “Axiomatic method”, “Alternative educational technologies”, “I-category”, “Quality of education”, “Personality qualities”, etc.), a significant percentage of which are newly formed concepts as well as established ones. The personal segment of the dictionary has been notably expanded with entries such as “Ananin Stepan Andriiovych”, “Arvat Fedir Stepanovych”, “Yavonenko Oleksandr Fedotovych”, “Carl Robert Jakobson”, and “Yaroshenko Olha Hryhorivna”. Therefore, it can be confidently stated that the author has creatively worked on the new edition of his work, which has become a significant phenomenon within the educational community.

The publication of the Pedagogical Dictionary edited by M. Yarmachenko (2001) marked another significant step in the encyclopaedisation of education during the period under review. With 2,513 entries, it might seem redundant to have another dictionary of a similar genre published by the same institution, the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine, within such a short span of four years. However, this perception is challenged by the arguments presented by M. Yarmachenko (2001) himself, who contributed 1,478 entries (59% of the total). He highly values S. Honcharenko’s (1997) dictionary, noting its broad range of reference materials, while also cautioning that the number of words and concepts covered is still limited, with the entries themselves being rather concise. The editor justifies the need for his own dictionary by highlighting the continuation of a tradition initiated in the 1920s of creating pedagogical dictionaries in Ukraine, such as the Dictionary of Pedagogical Terms from 1926, and the Russian-Ukrainian translated, rather than the explanatory

Dictionary of Pedagogical, Psychological, and School Self-Governance Terms from 1926-1927. Secondly, the period saw a revitalisation of creative pedagogical thought, resulting in significant changes and transformations that required timely encyclopaedic documentation. Thirdly, there was a surge in innovative activities in various educational institutions. Fourthly, there was a growing interest in pedagogical issues not only among specialists but also among the general public, thus creating a demand for information. In addition to these factors, it is important to mention the need to summarise the long-standing Ukrainian experience and traditions in the field of didactics, education, and folk pedagogy, which is imbued with “ideas of high humanism and true democracy, legendary heroism and courage, great folk humour towards friends and all-consuming sarcasm towards enemies and non-friends” M. Yarmachenko (2001). This evolutionary process is significantly reflected in the terms with a wide denotative range.

The authors of the analysed publication (a total of 76 renowned scientists), as well as the chief editor, aimed to systematically characterise, through terminology, the domains of general pedagogy, general theory of education, extracurricular and out-of-school activities, subject-specific methodologies, technical teaching aids, informatics, school studies, preschool and family education, higher education pedagogy, and more, using both synchronic and diachronic approaches. The interpretation of terms borrowed from related fields, which help to uncover the essential realities of pedagogy and education, was also included. These terms sometimes serve as a kind of methodological foundation for them. More extensive in terms of quantitative composition compared to S. Honcharenko (1997) is the register of personalities. A similar technology of the constitution of the entry is included in the convergence. While M. Yarmachenko (2001) emphasises in the Preface the conciseness of entries in the Ukrainian Pedagogical Dictionary by S. Honcharenko (1997), he himself refrains from

overly detailed definitions, skilfully condensing the information instead. It is worth noting that among the authors of the analysed work is also S. Honcharenko, who prepared 37 entries. Some of these either did not make it into his own dictionary (“Autonomous educational institution”, “Academic hour”, “Rozenberh Mark Yosypovych”, etc.) or are interpreted from a different perspective in the analysed work (“Academic freedom”, “Individual learning processes”, etc.).

The Encyclopaedia of Education, The Great Encyclopaedia. Thematic Register of Slogans in the Field of Pedagogical Sciences

The collective publication Encyclopaedia of Education (Kremen, 2008; Kremen *et al.*, 2021), which has undergone two editions separated by a 13-year interval, stands as the pinnacle of encyclopaedic endeavours in the field under study. This significant period has coincided with radical changes in the Ukrainian education system, including the introduction of the New Ukrainian School, the granting of autonomy to higher education institutions, changes in their status, the expansion of the subject matter of pedagogy, and the updating of educational content and assessment systems. The adoption of a cognitive-discursive scientific paradigm has allowed for a comprehensive interpretation of education as a holistic conceptual framework, enabling the reconstruction of verbal tools for organising information (knowledge, experience) about one of the most strategic spheres of human existence. Moreover, it has facilitated the identification and extrapolation of the priorities of the new education onto an axiological matrix through the lens of a conceptual and linguistic worldview (Serebrianska, 2019).

One of the semantic dominants of the logonym Encyclopaedia of Education is the lexical unit with the semantic organisation of “the sum of knowledge acquired through learning”, “the level of knowledge acquired through learning”, “raising the level of knowledge”, “the general level of knowledge”, “a system of educational activities”, and “a system of institutions and

establishments through which these activities are carried out”, according to V. Busel (2005). Therefore, it is essential to scrutinise the definitional markers of this scientific denotation and the denotation “pedagogy”, as well as their derivatives: “educational” and “pedagogical”. Their symmetrical and asymmetrical, as well as hypernymic-hyponymic nature, is revealed in the entries “Pedagogy” and “Education” prepared by S. Honcharenko (1997). Using his own directive guideline, according to which “an indisputable rule of scientific logic states that basic concepts and statements must be clearly defined”, Honcharenko characterises the correlational-determinative relationships between them as follows: “Pedagogy is a social science that unites, integrates, and synthesises data from all natural and social sciences related to the formation of personality... The object of pedagogy is education as a special, socially and personally determined activity of introducing a person to life in society, which is characterised by pedagogical goal-setting and pedagogical guidance...”; “Education is the process and result of an individual’s acquisition of a certain system of scientific knowledge, practical skills and abilities, and the associated level of development of their intellectual-cognitive and creative activity, as well as moral and aesthetic culture, which together determine the social face and individual uniqueness of this person... The concept of “Education” should be considered as a process of external influence on the individual’s assimilation of generalised, objective, social experience, norms, values, etc...” (Kremen, 2008; Kremen *et al.*, 2021).

The Encyclopaedia of Education is aptly described as a “reference-analytical work” (Kremen, 2008). The terms “analytical” and “multidisciplinary” are closely related, as they explicitly highlight the inclusion of “information from related fields that are significant for the development of contemporary education” (Kremen, 2008; Kremen *et al.*, 2021). Overall, it is a multidisciplinary and personal publication, with entries representing the denotative substances of the theory, history, and practice of Ukrainian education, the

terminological and conceptual foundations of pedagogical science, contemporary educational paradigms and concepts, as well as biographical information about educators and public figures who have influenced the development of national education. A notable feature of this encyclopaedia is the structure of its entries, which, with their detailed content and verbal organisation, more closely resemble in-depth scholarly entries than concise, standardised encyclopaedia entries. Almost all entries include a bibliography. The first and second editions have undergone significant changes, including alterations in the editorial board and the author collective (for example, the inclusion or exclusion of controversial figures like D. Tabachnyk and A. Tolstoukhov), as well as changes in the number of entries and their content. The second edition features the following notable changes: 1) the addition of new entries, 2) the removal of certain entries, and 3) the reworking of existing entries under different authorship and based on different principles.

There are also discrepancies in the quantity, and to some extent, the quality of entries between the two editions. Over the ten-year period between the publications, the field of education underwent significant changes, as evidenced by the entries beginning with the letter “A” (English: A). For instance, in 2008 35 entries started with “A”, while in 2021, this number increased to 78. The majority of these new entries reflect innovative processes in education and its modernisation in response to contemporary challenges. Examples include “Institutional autonomy in higher education”, “Academic autonomy of general secondary education institutions”, “Academic year”, “Academic integrity”, “Academic mobility”, “Academic freedom”, “Academic plagiarism”, “Academic ranking of universities, or ‘Shanghai’ ranking”, “UNESCO Associated School”, “Alternative learning”, “Teaching assistant” and others. Conversely, some entries from the 2008 edition were either omitted or modified in the 2021 edition due to changes in their relevance or the need for more specific or detailed information. For example, the entry

“Accreditation” (→ “Accreditation Commission of Ukraine”, “Institutional accreditation”, “Accreditation of educational programmes”), “Teacher certification”, “Certification of pedagogical, scientific-pedagogical and scientific staff” (→ “Certification of a researcher”, “Certification of a pedagogical worker”). Another process observed is the integration of entries primarily relating to established, clearly defined terms and concepts: “Adaptation” (← “Child adaptation to school”, “Professional adaptation”), or the removal of entries that are indirectly related to the field of pedagogy and education: “Academy of Medical Sciences of Ukraine (AMS of Ukraine)”, “Academy of Arts of Ukraine (AA of Ukraine)”. The list of notable figures has been significantly reduced, those who “represent and today define the face and authority” of science: from 132 in 2008 to 61 in 2021 (Karpilovska & Ziabliuk, 2009). Notable figures from other fields, such as the historian and composer M. Arkas, linguists L. Bulakhovskiy and O. Potebnia, and literary critic S. Yefremov, were not included in the newer edition. Similarly, ideologically charged figures like O. Mazurkevych, N. Krupskaya, and L. Tolstoy were omitted. The newer edition includes entries on prominent contemporary Ukrainian educators, including S. Honcharenko and M. Yarmachenko, who were instrumental in creating the encyclopaedia. Notably, their entries in the encyclopaedia itself represent a deeper, more nuanced, and historically contextualised analysis of their contributions compared to the earlier definitions provided in their own works.

“The stated intention in the first edition of the Encyclopaedia of Education to “continue working on the creation of encyclopaedic literature” has been partially realised. However, the authors acknowledge that the new edition cannot be considered “exhaustive, since the field of education is extremely broad and diverse” and is also as well as dynamic” (Kremen, 2008). The evolutionary processes occurring in science and society necessitate the periodic revision of encyclopaedic works. Such publications serve as a reflection of

a nation’s development, its standing in the global intellectual and civilisational landscape, and its ability to respond to contemporary challenges and future aspirations.

The Ukrainian Pedagogical Encyclopaedic Dictionary by S. Honcharenko (2011), produced by the State Scientific Institution “Encyclopaedic Publishing”, outlines the future prospects for encyclopaedisation of education. Its primary objective is to “define the place of pedagogical knowledge in the Great Universal Encyclopaedia... to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the specified segment and to better orientate the authors of future entries, as well as to stimulate scientific discussion, debate, and critique of the proposed entries in the dictionary”. Within the field of Pedagogical Sciences, a “family tree of concepts” has been developed in the form of a thematic register of terms, represented by specific groups of word-designations of scientific denotations, which, according to the authors of the analysed publication, “represent the pedagogical field in a conceptual-categorical paradigm” (Kyrydon, 2020). The implementation of this project will not only contribute to a deeper understanding and more qualified interpretation of the pedagogical and educational essence of terms and concepts but will also clarify the place of Ukrainian pedagogy and education in the European and global historical-pedagogical process, with its rational-constructive and opposing tendencies.

Conclusions

The development of pedagogical and educational terminology, a crucial component of any society’s knowledge base, has a long and complex history in Ukraine. Shaped by the country’s unique sociopolitical circumstances, this process experienced a significant resurgence following the renaissance of the Ukrainian language in the 1920s. The period of independence witnessed a particularly intense period of development, building upon centuries-old traditions of forming terminological and conceptual apparatus with a

strong emphasis on native Ukrainian terms. The publications produced during this period exhibit a wide range of encyclopaedic characteristics, varying in genre, target audience, and internal structure. Based on the criterion of “nature of information”, three primary models of encyclopaedic publications can be identified: specialised pedagogical encyclopaedias of pedagogical terms, specialised regional-personal publications, and pedagogical encyclopaedias. Each of these models is represented by a variety of individual or collective editions.

A comprehensive analysis of specific representatives of the third model, using a synchronic and diachronic approach, reveals that works such as the Ukrainian Pedagogical Dictionary and Ukrainian Pedagogical Encyclopaedic Dictionary by S. Honcharenko, the Pedagogical Dictionary edited by M. Yarmachenko, and the Encyclopaedia of Education (2008 and 2021) stand out for their substantial content, depth of interpretation, and sophisticated structure. Each of these works possesses unique characteristics in terms of the scope of information, the structure of entries, definitional norms, criteria for selecting personalities, and the presentation of scientific biographies. Moreover, they demonstrate a wide range of criteria for interpreting pedagogical and educational terms and concepts, including theoretical, applied, universal, prospective, national, specialised, sectoral, regional, retrospective, modern, rational-constructive, critical,

comparative, and other research aspects. These publications consistently adhere to encyclopaedic standards while simultaneously reflecting a national perspective and aligning with global standards. Ukraine can further strengthen its position in the international academic community by developing a comprehensive Great Universal Encyclopaedia that includes a dedicated section on Pedagogical Sciences. The Great Encyclopaedia. Thematic Register of Slogans in the Field of Pedagogical Sciences is viewed as a strategic step towards this goal, contributing to Ukraine’s national self-assertion and integration into the European and global community.

Future research should focus on a systematic analysis of both classical and syncretic works, comparing them to other information sources commonly used in contemporary educational and academic contexts, such as specialised pedagogical encyclopaedias of pedagogical terms and specialised regional-personal publications. Urgent tasks include the preparation of encyclopaedic studies that reflect innovative processes in pedagogy and education. These studies should also mirror the maturity of society and its level of intellectual development.

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

- [1] Bilousko, O.A. (Ed.). (2017). *Poltavika. Poltava encyclopaedia (Vol.1/3)*. Poltava: Poltavskiyi literator.
- [2] Busel, V.T. (Ed.). (2005). *Large explanatory dictionary of the modern Ukrainian language*. Irpin: Perun.
- [3] Bykov, V., Luparenko, L., & Pinchuk, O. (2022). [Ukrainian electronic encyclopaedia of education: First steps of project implementation](#). In A.M. Kyrydon (Ed.), *Ukrainian encyclopaedia studies as a component of information resistance: Materials of the All-Ukrainian scientific conference* (pp. 132-135). Kyiv.
- [4] Chernysh, N. (2015). [On the issue of the modern typology of encyclopaedias](#). *Bulletin of the Book Chamber*, 4, 3-9.
- [5] Dashko, Y. (2023). Information technologies in the educational process: Features and advantages. *Pedagogical Sciences*, 6(2), 46-51. [doi: 10.33989/2524-2474.2023.82.295094](#).

- [6] Filimonova, T. (2020). [Criteria for selecting slogans for the “Great Ukrainian encyclopaedia” in the field of “Pedagogical sciences”](#). In A.M. Kyrydon (Ed.), *Traditions and innovations in world encyclopaedias: Materials of the scientific conference* (pp. 113-115). Kyiv: State Research Institution “Encyclopaedia Press”.
- [7] Gurzhiy, A., Yatsyshyn, A., & Luparenko, L. (2022). Concept and genesis of the concept of “Online encyclopaedia” on the pages of Ukrainian scientific literature. *Collection of Scientific Works of the National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine. Series: Pedagogical Sciences*, 2(29), 172-191. [doi: 10.32453/pedzbirnyk.v29i2.1044](#).
- [8] Honcharenko, S.U. (1997). *Ukrainian pedagogical dictionary*. Kyiv: Lybid.
- [9] Honcharenko, S.U. (2011). *Ukrainian pedagogical encyclopaedic dictionary (2nd ed.)*. Rivne: Volynski oberehy.
- [10] Honcharuk, Yu.V. (2009). [Pedagogical terminology: Problems and solutions](#). *Scientific Works of the Black Sea State University named after Peter Mohyla of the Complex “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy”*. Series: Pedagogy, 112(99), 65-72.
- [11] Ishchenko, O., & Stepanenko, M. (2024). *Ukrainian encyclopaedias in current socio-communicative challenges*. Kyiv: Institute of Encyclopaedic Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. [doi: 10.37068/b/9786171402430](#).
- [12] Ivanytska, N.L. (2017). [Concept – word – term \(based on pedagogical terms\)](#). *Scientific Bulletin of the International Humanitarian University. Series: Philology*, 31(3), 28-31.
- [13] Karpilovska, Ye., & Ziabliuk, M. (2009). The encyclopaedia of the Ukrainian language: Structure and compiling principles. *The Encyclopaedia Herald of Ukraine*, 1, 47-53. [doi: 10.37068/evu.1.7](#).
- [14] Kremen, V.H. (Ed.). (2008). *Encyclopaedia of education*. Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter.
- [15] Kremen, V.H., et al. (Eds.). (2021). *Encyclopaedia of education (2nd ed.)*. Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter.
- [16] Krutii, K.L., & Funtikova, O.O. (2010). [Preschool education: Dictionary and reference guide. Over 1000 terms, concepts and names](#). Zaporizhzhia: LIPS.
- [17] Kyrydon, A.M. (Ed.). (2020). [The great encyclopaedia. Thematic register of slogans in the field of pedagogical sciences](#). Kyiv: State Research Institution “Encyclopaedia Press”.
- [18] Lapaenko, S.V. (2021). [Pedagogy and psychology in terms, concepts, personalities](#). In R.A. Kalenyshenko & I.O. Pietukhova (Eds.), *Actual problems of psychological and social adaptation in a crisis society: Materials of the 6th International scientific and practical conference* (pp. 161-164). Irpin: University of the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine.
- [19] Lukianova, L.B., & Anishchenko, O.V. (2014). [Adult education: A glossary of terms](#). Nizhyn: P.P. Lysenko.
- [20] Prokopenko, I.F., & Lozova, V.I. (Ed.). (1994). [Pedagogical Kharkiv region](#). Kharkiv: H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University.
- [21] Pylypenko, H., & Fedorova, N. (2020). [Science as a factor of socio-economic development of society](#). Dnipro: Dnipro University of Technology.
- [22] Semenova, A.V. (Ed.). (2006). [Dictionary and reference book on professional pedagogy](#). Odesa: Palmira.
- [23] Serebrianska, I.M. (2019). [The concept “Education” in discourse measurements](#). (Doctoral dissertation, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine).
- [24] Sukhomlynska, O.V. (2021). [On the formation of Ukrainian pedagogical terminology: Historiographical aspect](#). In L.D. Berezivska (Ed.), *Conceptual and terminological apparatus of historical and pedagogical research: History and modern approaches. Materials of the 6th International scientific and practical conference* (pp. 8-10). Vinnytsia: Nilan-LTD.
- [25] Trishchuk, O. (2018). The socio-communicative approach to the investigation of the editorial-publishing process. *Printing Horizon*, 1, 218-231. [doi: 10.20535/2522-1078.2018.1.132919](#).

- [26] Usyk, V.V., & Astapov, O.M. (2011). [Development of an electronic textbook as a means of improving the efficiency of teaching in higher education institutions](#). *Scientific Works of Kharkiv National Air Force University*, 2, 209-212.
- [27] Yarmachenko, M.D. (Ed.). (2001). *Pedagogical dictionary*. Kyiv: Pedahohichna dumka.
- [28] Yatsyshyn, A.V. (2023). ["Ukrainian electronic encyclopaedia of education" as a digital resource for preserving national pedagogy and psychology assets](#). In O. Pinchuk & N. Yaskova, *Digital transformation of education in Ukraine under martial law: Materials of the scientific conference* (pp. 80-82). Kyiv: Institute of Digitalization of Education of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- [29] Yatsyshyn, A.V., Burov, O.Yu., & Nosenko, Yu.H. (2021). [Online encyclopaedias: Current state and development prospects](#). In *Academic Youth-2021: Materials of the 9th All-Ukrainian scientific and practical conference of junior academics* (pp. 148-156). Kyiv: Institute of Digitalization of Education of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- [30] Zhelezniak, M. (2020). Capability of the encyclopaedia of modern Ukraine in progress of the national education area. *Scientific Notes of Ostroh Academy National University, "Historical Sciences" Series*, 31, 142-150. doi: [10.25264/2409-6806-2020-31-142-150](https://doi.org/10.25264/2409-6806-2020-31-142-150).
- [31] Zhelezniak, M.H., Ishchenko, O.S., Ocheretianko, S.I., & Davydenko, O.V. (2021). *Ukrainian electronic encyclopaedia in the social-cultural dimension*. Kyiv: Institute of Encyclopaedic Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. doi: [10.37068/b/9789660296770](https://doi.org/10.37068/b/9789660296770).

Енциклопедія української освіти доби незалежності: тезаурус теорії, практики, персоналій

Микола Степаненко

Доктор філологічних наук, професор
Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України
03041, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6727-1265>

Ніна Степаненко

Кандидат філологічних наук, доцент
Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України
03041, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0934-784X>

Анотація. Актуальність праці зумовлена потребою цілісного дослідження термінологійно-поняттєвого апарату педагогіки на засадах класичної та модерної енциклопедистики. Метою статті був комплексний аналіз сучасних найавторитетніших із погляду енциклопедичного стандарту, змістової структури, україноцентричності й зорієнтованості на європейські традиції енциклопедичних видань. Використано адекватні теоретичні, емпірійно-теоретичні, емпірійні методи з метою ґрунтовного вивчення корпусу педагогічних знань крізь призму термінологійно-поняттєвого апарату та прецедентних особистостей із наданням переваги методам аналізу дефініцій і контент-аналізу, порівняльно-зіставному та класифікаційному методам. Різновекторно проаналізовано процес номінування, лексикографування, термінографування наукових денотатів з інтегрувальним критерієм «педагогічні, освітні реалії». Об'єктом дослідження обрано етапні

енциклопедійні видання чітко окресленого хронологічного зрізу – кінець XX – початок XXI ст. (доба незалежності), а предметом – «Педагогічний словник», «Педагогічний енциклопедичний словник» С. Гончаренка, «Педагогічний словник» за ред. М. Ярмаченка, першу й другу редакції колективного видання Національної академії наук України «Енциклопедія освіти», макет «Великої енциклопедії. Тематичного реєстру гасел з напрямку “Педагогічні науки”», що програмує через змістово-інформативний контент «родовідне дерево понять» у вигляді тематичних груп як репрезентантів напрямку «Педагогічні знання» у «Великій універсальній енциклопедії». Зроблено спробу класифікування досліджуваного енциклопедійного контенту з виокремленням найтипівіших моделей з об’єднувальними маркерами «спеціалізоване видання», «регіональне видання», «персональне видання», «власне енциклопедійне видання». Дослідження здійснено крізь синхронійно-діахронійну призму з акцентуванням на компендіумі знань про культивовану педагогічну, освітню термінологію та знакові персоналії, які представляють у різних вимірах сферу педагогіки й освіти. Докладно проінтерпретовано специфіку реєстру вирізнених праць, дефінітивні стандарти гасел, їхні релевантні характеристики у проєкції на гармонійний синтез енциклопедійного універсалізму та ідіостильових особливостей конкретно взятого видання і сукупного контексту. Застосовано порівняльний аналіз видань з метою комплексної характеристики динамічних процесів у педагогічній, освітній термінологійно-поняттєвій системі на тлі національного та світового наукового й історико-культурного поступу. Результати дослідження можуть бути застосовані в енциклопедографії, термінографії, практиці викладання предметів педагогічного циклу

Ключові слова: освітня сфера; педагогічні енциклопедійні видання; термінологійно-поняттєвий апарат; педагогічний словник; педагогічні науки