Future Academy®
Offering excellence in Social and Behavioural Sciences

The European Proceedings of
Social & Behavioural Sciences
EpSBS

eISSN: 2357-1330

IFTE 2016 : 2nd International Forum on Teacher Education

The Experience of Teaching Philology in the Context of New Educational Technologies: the Value Approaches to the Study of Literary Texts

Maya M. Polekhina[a]*

* Corresponding author: Maya M. Polekhina, illusio2008@yandex.ru

[a] *The branch of MGIMO MIA of Russia in Odintsovo, 85 Govorova Street, apartment 31, Odintsovo, illusio2008@yandex.ru, 8 (967) 271 88 88*

Abstract

http://dx.doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2016.07.57

In this article, an innovative approach to teaching the history of literature is examined, when the use of interactive forms, methods and technologies increases effectiveness of educational process, positively influences on learning the material by students, and orients students to resolve problem situations independently. It activates the self-development of students and encourages them to develop their innovation culture. A teacher, instead of fulfilling an information provider function, becomes a partner of creative activity. Students shift from an object of teaching to a subject of interaction. Each stage of work suggests summarizing, giving feedback, co-evaluation and conclusiveness of arguments. A teacher not only raises a problem, but also coordinates its discussion, and organizes interactions between opponents. Analytical work, aimed at studying of writers' texts to define stylistic dominance of their work, memoirs of their contemporaries, brief analyses of genre forms in their work, helps students to understand the creative individuality of artists, define the features of their artistic world, and conceptualize their own position. The teacher leads students to a conclusion, decision-making under uncertainty, and a problem situation, when there is no direct information and the truth is disclosed in discussion. The success is determined by the awareness, competence, scientific correctness, and value systems of the participants of discussion. In turn, a teacher is required to be competent in conducting discussion procedures. At the end of the lesson students write creative works, which will be published on the web site for further discussion and assessment.

© 2016 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.uk

Keywords: Philology; innovation; creativity; value orientation; competence.

1. Introduction

This research is a matter of current topical issues, since the sociocultural situation, which involves the use of interactive technologies in teaching philological disciplines, and which significantly

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

increases the effectiveness of educational processes, is now a consideration as the main component of education upgrading, and defines the direction of methodological studies. The innovation approach to teaching philological disciplines suggests introducing novelty into educational process. It is specified by peculiarities of modern education, and individual needs.

We are going to consider the use of interactive forms, methods and technologies of teaching, which involves the recipients and students in the learning process. Students become partners of creative activity, have an opportunity to reflect on the submitted teaching material, and are open to self-development. S.I. Hessen, an outstanding philosopher, philologist and pedagogue, in the beginning of the last century stated that “the real education is not a process of transferring ready-made cultural content to the new generation; it is a process of making the new generation aware of the development, following which this generation can create their own new content of the culture. A pedagogue should provide students with the tool-set, which students can use to expand their knowledge, develop their skills, as well as make them use their personal efforts and personal resources without assistance” (Hessen, 1995). A collaborative activity of the teacher and students envisages introducing particular individual contribution to the educational process. Obviously, it greatly increases the effectiveness of studying teaching material, regularly directing them to the innovative activity, and developing their innovation culture.

The modern pedagogical innovations researchers emphasize in their works that, information-exchange interaction "man - information - man" promotes a high level of the educational process organization, where the teacher develops a flexible and mobile learning system, maintaining independent and active work of students through intensive communications with the help of information-educational environment (Golikova, 2014; Egorshin, Gus’kova, 2010). First of all, in the contemporary education the idea of the value approach is bound with the humanistic paradigm, where all condition for individual self-development, realizing his potential, nurturing a sense self-esteem, creativity, professional and common cultural competence are included in the learning process (Terentyeva, 2011).

2. Main part

As an example of studying drama by Mikhail Bulgakov, particularly, the history of the play - “Alexander Pushkin”, we are going to consider a variety of possible forms of interactive learning, interaction between a teacher and students. The forms of interaction involve immersion into the atmosphere of business cooperation and co-creation in solving a number of problems. Initially the material is not presented in the form of lectures, where a teacher functions as an information provider, and where his monologue is actualized. It is presented in the form of a joint problem-discussion of the creative situation, which has arisen around one of the most controversial works of Bulgakov, where students act as opponents, defending a particular point of view, and become carriers of certain concepts.

http://dx.doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2016.07.57
eISSN: 2357-1330 / Corresponding Author: Maya M. Polekhina
Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of the conference

The teacher raises a problem, which was associated with Bulgakov in the 1930s such as, the artist and power. Thus, it is necessary to find the answers to the following questions: Why did Bulgakov appeal to this problem that period of time? How did the era of the early 30th characterize the memoirs of contemporaries, academic works of literature researchers, historical and philosophical works? In what way was the “divergence” of views among artists expressed? A man in time, in space-time continuum era – was what attracted Bulgakov to become a subject of interpretation and reflection, at the beginning of the 1930s. The letters, which were sent to V. Veresaev, reflect the difficult period of Mikhail Bulgakov’s life, when everything he created was subjected to severe criticism: the plays performed in theatres were canceled, magazines did not publish his works, his family felt a great need, Joint State Political Directorate conducted a search of Bulgakov’s home, confiscated manuscripts, diaries, notebooks and books. Verbatim reports, which were kept in archive of the writer, recreates the atmosphere of those years in the halls of Moscow Art Theater, where the debate on the "The Days of the Turbines" was held.

An artist and power was the problem, which occupied M. Bulgakov that period of time when he appealed to the play about the last days of Alexander Pushkin. M. Bulgakov highly appreciated the genius of the poet and his importance in further development of the literature. Mikhail Bulgakov, like Pushkin, felt the suffocating pressure of time, in an atmosphere of social and moral tyranny, which made him become acutely aware of his tragic loneliness. Unsuccessful attempts, which were made by Bulgakov to travel outside Russia, were strikingly similar to the aspirations of Pushkin in "southern" exile to go to Greece. Both, Alexander Pushkin and Mikhail Bulgakov, became hostages of their own Motherland. Just like Pushkin, Bulgakov aimed to find the answers to the questions, which deliberately tormented him. These questions were about the free gift of the artist and art law, about the will of the Creator, and the overwhelming power of the authorities. It should be highlighted that students should be also imbued with the special feeling that was inherent in the artist, who turned to the Pushkin theme. And, as a consequence, it is necessary here to reconstruct the creative experiments carried out by V. Solovyov, V. Bryusov, V. Khodasevich, O. Mandelstam, M. Tsvetaeva. Bulgakov, who considered Pushkin as the perfect embodiment of the fate of the poet, the genius of goodness and justice, as well as the great suppressor of devilish start. Bulgakov considered Pushkin as a poet, who harmonized the world in truth and beauty. The ethics of evil and injustice, and the violation of moral and ethical laws of existence were the subjects of the interest of Bulgakov. He also appealed to the issues of power and its disastrous impact on a creative personality.

Students examine a broad range of issues related to the artist's perception of the world in the crucial epoch of social development. And, as a result, they define the most global problem – the problem of creative personality, which penetrates into all spheres of social and culture life. To confirm their own concepts, they use individual messages, creative projects on the fate of a particular writer of the Stalin epoch; memoirs of contemporaries, movie fragments, paintings reproduction, and pieces of music. The messages are arranged in the following way: Soviet official culture, which is in direct dependence on political state units and independent Russian culture, presented by a literature stratum, later known as “returned”. Students discuss all possible positions. It demonstrates and develops students’ analytical and critical thinking skills, as well as teaches them to prove and defend their points of view or any

thesis by using heated arguments. It also provides students with an opportunity to develop their rhetorical skills and skills of non-verbal communication. The current activity suggests special training such as reading critical literature, indicated by the teacher in advance, using the archive materials, the products of contemporary information processing technologies (Internet resources and e-learning resources). It is necessary not only to find information, but also to determine its degree of reliability. In this regard, every lesson is considered as summarizing the preliminary individual work of students in accordance with the consultations, which are provided by a teacher in a predetermined time via Skype. As a result, active participation of each and every student in the educational process makes them shift from an object of teaching to a subject of interaction. It is very important to master the skills of ethical behavior under collective interaction conditions, be able to listen and understand the participants of the dialogue.

Each stage of work suggests summarizing, having feedback, co-evaluation and conclusiveness of arguments. As illustrative material can be used for movies and documentary fragments, performances of experts and specialists, materials, manuscript collections, etc. In its turn, the function of a teacher is not only to initiate the problem, but also to coordinate its discussions and to organize the interaction between the opponents. Moreover, it should be pointed out that a teacher should provide students with an opportunity to reflect on what they heard, on their speculations, and how they could solve the problem without assistance. In case of unexpected difficulties, the teacher can intervene in the course of the discussion, as well as coordinate the clarification of certain provisions and objectives.

The next stage of the discussion of the history of the play -"Aleksandr Pushkin", is the consideration of the history of the co-authorship of Bulgakov and Veresaev. It is important to find out why Bulgakov chose Veresaev as a co-author. Was there initially any differences in the characteristics and aesthetic principles of the co-authors, which predetermined the impossibility of such creative union?

It is useful to consider the history of relationships of co-authors of the future play through letters, which writers sent to each other, in discussing the features of the creative personality of both artists, Bulgakov and Veresaev. M. Bulgakov invited V. Veresaev for cooperation on the text of the play. Vikenty Veresaev was a famous writer, publicist, and historian of literature and the author of several books on Pushkin (“Pushkin in life”, “Pushkin’s contemporaries”). The decision was not made accidentally. Mikhail Bulgakov trusted Vikenty Veresaev implicitly. They had friendly relationships. For instance, Bulgakov wrote Veresaev when he was unwell (insomnia, weakness, fear of being alone) and about his financial instability. He often appealed to V. Veresaev for advice and routine matters. Bulgakov found in Veresaev a patient interlocutor of the creative plans, his work in the theater, etc. Another important detail is that Veresaev was much older than Bulgakov. He had the reputation of a venerable writer and later owner of the Stalin Prize, while M. Bulgakov did not and was argued a lot. One of the well-known episode was in the writers' communities at a party on the birthday of the wife of K.A. Trenev where Pasternak delivered a speech and opposed V. Veresaev to Mikhail Bulgakov, he said: "I want to drink for Bulgakov ... Veresaev, of course, is a very big man, but he is a legitimate phenomenon, and Bulgakov is illegal" (Bulgakov, 2004).

The writers made a cooperative agreement on a new play. Bulgakov had great hopes in it. Bulgakov was familiar with the book about Pushkin written by V. Veresaev, which contained wealthy factual

http://dx.doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2016.07.57
eISSN: 2357-1330 / Corresponding Author: Maya M. Polekhina
Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of the conference

materials about the poet, his meetings, hobbies, moods, habits. The memoirs of contemporaries of Pushkin, the legend of Pushkin, the history associated with the “birth” of his individual texts were included in the book. The title of the book “Pushkin in life” was given intentionally. Vikenty Versaev sought to show an outstanding poet and “a child of a tiny world” with all weaknesses and shortcomings. While for Bulgakov, Pushkin remained a genius, who was not understood and accepted by his contemporaries, and was endlessly lonely and unattainable in his perfection.

The meeting of the co-authors took place in the autumn in 1934. The majority of the conceptual provisions of the new play at the time had already been thought out. It is interesting to note that before the moment when the agreement was made, Bulgakov sent a letter to V. Veresaev, in which he shared his impressions from reading the N. Teleshov book “Literary memoirs”, in which the author talks about the nicknames of writers in the literary communities. For the “inviolability of views”, V. Veresaev was named “Stone Bridge”. “And I liked it”, - added Mikhail Bulgakov. However, the "inviolability of views" between differences when working on future play will not allow the co-authors to come to a compromise.

It is very important to understand that the literary material was relevant to both authors, first of all, because it provided them with an opportunity to talk about their time, to express their attitude to power and its surroundings. But, Elena Bulgakova noted, writers spoke different languages, each of them had their own principled position. From the memoirs of E. Bulgakova, the co-authors suffered from their cooperation in the summer months in 1935, "they brought each other torments"(Bulgakov, 2004).

The significant material for accomplishing the indicated tasks by students will be their work on their analytical study of short texts written by Mikhail Bulgakov and V. Veresaev, memoirs of contemporaries about writers, as well as its own philological analysis of small genre forms of creativity. The teacher, taking into account the creative and intellectual abilities of students, determines individual assignments. The teacher leads students to a conclusion, decision-making under uncertainty, a problem situation, when there is no direct information, and the truth is being disclosed in the process of discussion of material. However, the teacher can define the algorithm of such discussion.

An important interactive teaching method in this case is the focus on discussing the problem, accompanied by the exchange of ideas, opinions, and views. The letter written by M. Bulgakov to B. Veresaev, as well as the artistic text of the play can serve as the material of discussion. The question of the creative individuality of each artist is very important in identifying of the nature of the problem indicated by the "artist and power." Veresaev, being at that time a famous writer, publicist, historian of literature, and the author of several books about Pushkin, defended the truth of the fact, the identity of the historical events. For Bulgakov, the priority was an artistic interpretation of historical material, philosophical and aesthetic refraction of the events and destinies through the prism of their own experience. Bulgakov implicitly accepted the historical and biographical basis of the play, advanced by Veresaev, but rejected the proposed dramaturgy of the text: Bulgakov accused Veresaev of the destruction of the dramatic narrative genre, stylistic inconsistency in character, in the humiliation of images lifeless masks.

The intensive debates did not abate around the image of Pushkin. Veresaev shared Pushkin-poet and Pushkin-person, understanding the gap between one and the other. Bulgakov, by contrast, opposed to

the separation from one another, emphasizing the wholeness of the figure of Pushkin, the poet for him is "revolutionary spirit", "sunny genius', a humanist, a fighter against violence and tyranny. He carefully examined the historical materials from the duel and death of the poet, taking into study, the forms of faith that existed at the moment. A. Tamarchenko was one of the first to note that these discrepancies of the image of Pushkin reflected on a certain level, the perception of the individual level in history, including the Pushkin studies, whose representative was Veresaev. Through artistic intuition Bulgakov tried to comprehend the deep layers of the historical truth, associated with the image of a national hero. The literary material was relevant to Bulgakov as an opportunity to talk about his time, to express their attitude to power and its surroundings. All of these issues can be subjects of discussion with the student audience.

The efficiency of the usage of educational discussions, as a perspective method of teaching, is determined by a number of factors, primarily by the urgency of the subject matter. The problem of “Artist and Power” is the most important problem of literature and art, and today, it is a part and parcel of the modern educational programmes, and the decisions of the Commission. It is shown in relation of the heads of states to culture and artistic intelligentsia of the country. A significant factor in the educational process is a comparison of the various positions of the participants of discussion. In this case, the success will be determined by the awareness, competence, scientific correctness, and value systems of the participants of discussion. In turn, a teacher is required to be competent in conducting discussion procedures.

The Round Table discussion, as a variety of seminars, can be use in order to complete the discussion of the problem. All participants of the Round Table discussion act as opponents, have equal rights in expressing their point of view. At the end of the meeting, ideas and opinions on the discussed issues can be summarized in order to indicate the prospects for further work, without taking any concrete decisions. An alternative to the final Round Table can be educational and creative activities in forms of colloquium, which involves the discussion of a wide range of problems of one of the sections of the lecture course “The History of Russian Drama 1920-30” led by the teacher. This form of lesson can be also considered as a form of control, which allows the teacher in a relatively short period of time, to find out the level of knowledge of students on the list of historical and literary courses. Learners are provided with an opportunity to express their views on the considered issues, justify and defend them. By arguing and defending their views, students at the same time show how deeply and consciously they have learned the studied material. At the end of the lessons, students write creative work, which will be published on the web site for further discussion and assessment.

3. Conclusion

The use of interactive forms, methods, and technologies in teaching students of philological faculty on historical and literary courses, develops the creative thinking skills of students, a willingness to valuable self-determination, the ability to conceptually see the problem, to penetrate deeply into the

essence of the materials, and to successfully generate new ideas. Consequently, it prepares students for the efficient use of the acquired knowledge and skills in their future professional activity.

References

Bulgakov, M.A. (2004). Collected works in eight volumes: Tom 8: Pis`ma, 605.
Hessen, S.I. (1995). Basics of pedagogy. Introduction to applied philosophy, 88.
Golikova, G.A. (2014). Formation of the Axiological Approach to the Formal Literary Education: Problem Definition. *Pedagogy and Education*, 1, 14 - 24.
Danilkina, N.V. (2010). Love, duty and individual being: an attempt of philosophical synthesis in education ethic of S.I. Hessena. *Materials of All-Russian Youth Conference "Theoretical and applied ethics: traditions and perspectives"*, 63 - 67.
Egorshin, A.P. & Gus'kova I.V. (2010) Higher education in Russia: achievements, problems and prospects. *Higher education in Russia,* 6, 14 - 21.
Karpov, A.O. (2014). Open innovations and higher education. *Higher education in Russia*, 3, 37- 44.
Kashlev, S.S. (2013). Interactive methods of teaching, 224.
Logunova, N. (2000). Education as communication and co-creation. *Higher education in Russia*, 3, 108 - 110.
Popova, E.V. (2004). The value approach to study of literary creation, 256.
Rozov, N.S. (1993). The philosophy of humanitarian education (value basis of humanitarian education in higher school), 194.
Strongin, R.G., Chuprunov, E.V. (2014). Innovative education: the role of forestall strategy and integration. *Higher education in Russia*, 12, 5 -14.
Terentyeva, N.P. (2011). Axiologization as a strategy of literary education. Philological education: current policies and practices: *collection. scientific-method. Art. Vol. 1*, 62 - 68.