

Pedagogy in the Field of Art and Design in Russia

*Ulyana Aristova*¹ and *Liliya Zhilina*²

¹*National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia*

²*Moscow State Pedagogical University, Russia*

CHAPTER MENU

Artistic Pedagogical Traditions of the Constitutional Period, 2
The Formation and Evolution of Teaching Methods of Fine and Decorative Art during the Institutional Period, 3
Concepts Underpinning the Teaching of Fine and Decorative Arts and Design in Russian Educational Establishments since 1900, 10
Other Methods and Approaches to Design Teaching, 13
References, 16

Throughout its development, pedagogy in the field of art and design in Russia was consistently shaped by a phenomenon defined by experts as art pedagogy; this can be defined as a transmission system of methods, forms, and techniques for the teaching of decorative art, monumental art and design, and contemporary artistic practices. This approach to artistic pedagogy is consistent and can be chronologically traced at all levels of secondary, secondary professional, and higher education.

Historically, in the Russian educational context, art pedagogy has been simultaneously implemented in institutions at various levels (schools, colleges, universities) and at institutions of additional education (art schools, studios, workshops, leisure centers). The former institutions comprise secondary schools, including those that specialize in the aesthetic domain, whereas the latter encompass art schools and art studios at children's creativity and leisure centers. They all represent a single area where art pedagogy at all stages of its historical development was formed and established. Thus, it is necessary to note a high degree of centralization and unity in the Russian educational sphere; its homogeneity is backed by unified learning approaches, curricula, textbooks, and educational concepts over many decades.

In terms of its historical development, art pedagogy can be seen to have gone through three broad distinctive periods as follows: The first period, between the tenth and seventeenth centuries, is known as "constitutional" (the training was mostly conducted at workshops); the second period, between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries, is known as "institutional" (as a result of the formation of specialist institutes); and the

third period, up to the present moment, is known as postinstitutional (characterized by an integrated form of education).

The official view of art pedagogy, a consensus of professionals in defining it as a phenomenon, is reflected in the number of encyclopedias and academic works by Russian scientists. The phenomenon of the publication of iconic encyclopedias in Russia is represented by Brockhaus and Efron (1898) and subsequently by the *Great and Small Soviet Pedagogical Encyclopedia*, published in the years following, up until 1990. Art pedagogy is directly related to the history of Russian art education in the field of art and design in its constitutional, institutional, and postinstitutional periods, and has gone hand in hand with the development of the artistic method since the nineteenth century. Its structure and content as an area of academic knowledge developed amid the emergence of various forms of acquisition. Its peculiarity is the fact that the appearance of each method of training did not preclude the existence of the preceding one. Teaching methods could be used simultaneously in accordance with learning objectives. The concepts surrounding the methodology of teaching fine and decorative arts and design are key to the basis of artistic pedagogy, from which methods of teaching drawing in Russian educational institutions were formed and developed.

Artistic Pedagogical Traditions of the Constitutional Period

In the constitutional training period (tenth–seventeenth centuries), fine and decorative arts were carried out by imparting visual techniques and artistic techniques of material processing (metal, stone, etc.) from generation to generation and from master to apprentice. This approach was common for peoples inhabiting the core and adjacent territory of ancient Russia in the pre-Christian period. Subsequently, the process of transferring artistic practices was influenced by Byzantine artistic and educational traditions. Ancient Russia's close cultural and trade relations with Byzantium, the development of similar visual art forms in both countries, and the adoption of Christianity as a state religion were reflected in Russian culture and influenced the development of art practices in the later period.

In the tenth century, along with forms of the visual arts such as painting and monumental painting (fresco and mosaic), handwritten book illustrations and miniatures reached a high stage of development; examples of these include *The Ostromir Gospels* (1056–1057), *Izbornik Svyatoslava* (1073), *Trier Psalter* (1078–1087), and *The Gospel of Dobrinovo* (1164). Such manuscripts contain drawings and calligraphy, including heads of animals, birds, and even people. Thus, literacy was combined with drawing.

Scientist-archeologists suggest that the training was based on copying, involving the redrawing of samples. This method of training had been brought to ancient Russia by Greek and Byzantine teachers; from this point on, the Russian clergy were its representatives. Methods of drawing images on birch bark letters found in Novgorod date from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and resemble the methods of ancient Greek artists who used a stylus on wax beech boards. Birch bark was a more affordable material that did not require additional treatment. Accordingly, drawing required both silver styluses and goose-quill pens, ink, brushes, and paint.

Almonry schools (male and female), where masters acquired their professional skills in all of the types of art that existed at the time, had no special drawing classes or exercises.

Students gained drawing skills while rewriting books, repainting copybooks and headpieces, and carefully copying red letters (i.e., initials) decorated with patterns. The most difficult and responsible work was “the counts” – contour lines pierced in the ground (gesso or wet plaster) to enable the fresco or icon master to fill specific areas with color. Students studied techniques for a considerable amount of time so that they could freely but firmly apply the outline of shapes on the fresh ground. Accuracy and precision were required. At first, the pattern was indented with a brush or charcoal, and then it was improved and fixed using a solid tool – in other words, the counterline was defined. Starting with the drawing on the gesso and completing the finished icon with pattern work, which was strictly observed, such details as faces and figures as well as the folds of clothes were carefully drawn in.

To acquire strong skills, students mostly painted using brush and pen, as fresco painting requires a steady hand. Special exercise books and albums of original drawings were used to study the characteristics of the iconographic pattern and to copy them. A vivid example is the album from Antonieva Siya monastery, compiled from the work of earlier centuries by a monk painter, named as Nicodemus, which contains line drawings of Procopius, Chirino, and other icons.

However, students did not start by copying samples; the preparatory process included several stages. At first a student had to learn how to copy images through transparent paper (i.e., tracing paper), mechanically copy the pattern, and then learn how to work with album samples and drawings. Copybooks consisted mainly of original drawings, where all the lines were pierced with a needle. The student first drew by transferring coal powder through perforations on a blank sheet of paper using pounce and then finished the work according to the pattern. Only then could the student proceed by direct copying from the originals.

Later, the copy method of learning became fundamental in the training of painters, as it was deemed essential to depict saints’ faces and figures correctly. Vast collections of rules and laws for the construction of images were compiled for the organization of academic work by the leading masters. Initially, training was limited to copying the originals and then it switched to independent drawing. The copy method of learning remained the most prominent until the mid-eighteenth century and was used widely in iconographic schools, workshops, and spiritual academies.

The Formation and Evolution of Teaching Methods of Fine and Decorative Art during the Institutional Period

The history of teaching drawing is described in the tutorial *History of Methods of Teaching Drawing* (Rostovtsev 1982). Today it is the most complete and detailed publication on this issue. Individual teachers played an important role in the process of the formation and development of the methods of teaching, as they were at the forefront of art pedagogy and manifested their experience in the content of textbooks and teaching materials.

The next stage of the development of methods of training refers to the period in which art education began to build a system and to acquire institutional forms. This process took place during the period of the secularization of art and the spread of secular architecture, painting, prints, and sculpture, which began in the eighteenth century. The

opening of academies of fine arts in European countries pushed Moscovia in Russia to enhance diplomatic and cultural relations with Western European countries, thereby preparing the ground for significant changes in the development and establishment of teaching methods in fine art at that time.

In the time of Ivan III (reigned 1462–1505), Russia started to invite foreign artists to implement large-scale government and public art projects. In 1724, Peter I signed “The Draft Project of the Establishment of the Academy of Sciences and Arts,” but his successors did not take this progressive idea into consideration until November 1757. A strong rise of traditional Russian culture in the eighteenth century was associated with the establishment of the Academy of Arts in St. Petersburg on the initiative of the great Russian scientist M. Lomonosov and the Enlightenment figure N. Shuvalov; the latter headed the academy and was engaged in extensive scientific activities. The activities of the academy have led to the rise of a whole galaxy of Russian artists, architects, and educators.

This period became the time of formation and the heyday of the Russian academic school of drawing and painting. The eighteenth century is perceived as the golden age in the history of teaching methods of drawing; moreover, it indicates the formation of a new teaching system – an academic one. The new system established clear requirements not only for students but also for teachers. The most characteristic feature of this period is the establishment of special educational institutions – academies of arts and art schools. The establishment of methods of teaching drawing in secular educational institutions also belongs to this period.

During the creation of the Academy of Arts in the eighteenth century, classicism was a leading stylistic direction in Europe. The development of aesthetic principles of Russian classicism (such as citizenship) and the celebration of great deeds for the homeland’s benefit (which became the basis of this direction in Russia) brought Russian classicism to the peak of its expression. The goals set by the academy for the audience were imbued with the national character. All of this found its reflection in the topics pursued by the students, and this academic approach to learning echoed national ideals.

One of the founders of Russian art pedagogy in this period was Anton Pavlovich Losenko, a painter who formulated a strict program of education and developed the methodology of teaching drawing; his theoretical works were devoted to proportions and anatomy. Well-known artists and teachers, former graduates, were involved in teaching at the Academy of Arts for many years. They retained and developed academic traditions and pedagogical heritage. Among them were such artists as Andrey Ivanovich Ivanov, Vasily Kozmich Shebuev, Alexey Gavrilovich Venetsianov, Andrey Petrovich Sapozhnikov, Karl Pavlovich Bryullov, Orest Adamovich Kiprensky, Fyodor Antonovich Bruni, Pavel Petrovich Chistyakov, Ilya Repin, and Valentin Serov.

A new artistic direction, Romanticism, evolved at this time. Graduates of the Academy of Arts created works in this style to match the mood of the advanced Russian social circles. Such artists as K.P. Bryullov, who taught at the Academy of Arts, made a significant contribution to art education. The input provided by the academy in the field of teaching methods of drawing, painting, and composition is inestimable. Teachers at academies across Russia primarily explored how to improve the methodology and facilitate and streamline the process of learning. It was felt that methods of teaching and learning should be scientifically based; the art itself and the artist’s success were deemed to be a result of scientific knowledge and diligence. The academies stuck to a clear and

strict system of education based around the desire to enlighten and uplift the feelings of the artist. A well-defined and organized system of art education, established in the academies, began to influence methods of teaching drawing in secondary schools, which were traditionally entered at the age of 8 and concluded at the age of 18 or 19.

Undoubtedly, the process of education is a living one. Gradually, individual teachers of the Academy of Arts developed their own working methods, though this process was not arbitrary and accidental. The individual systems and methods of each teacher were constructed in accordance with the general academic training objectives and directions of the development of art, and the level of development of pedagogy of that time. A.P. Losenko's pedagogical system and the pedagogical activities of A.I. Ivanov, V.K. Shebuev, and A.E. Egorov are noteworthy.

The Academy of Arts had to face two issues closely connected with each other: the development of art education and the development of national art. The graduates of the academy had mastered drawing, art, modeling, and composition perfectly; the laws of perspective were familiar to them. It is commonly known that the copying technique formed the foundation of artists' training at this time. A book published in Russian in 1795 by I. Preisler – *Thorough Rules, or A Quick Guide to Drawing Art* – formed the methodological basis of training the copying technique. Preisler's system starts with an explanation of the purpose of drawing straight and curved lines, then geometric shapes and bodies, and, finally, rules of their use in practice. The author methodically shows the student how to master the art of drawing from the simple to the complex. Like most drawing teachers of the time, the basis of his teaching is geometry. Geometry helps the draftsman to see and understand the shape of the object and simplifies the process of constructing images on the plane. The use of geometric shapes must be combined with knowledge of the rules and laws of perspective, and surface anatomy.

Preisler's book was much appreciated by his contemporaries. It was reprinted several times both abroad and in Russia and ran to several editions. His educational guide to drawing was the most detailed and had the clearest methodology of any of the available publications, which is why it was an indispensable source in Russia for a long time, in schools and in special art schools.

Karl Bryullov's Principles of Pedagogy

Among various classes offered by academic artists, the "Bryullov Academy" stood out. In the first half of the nineteenth century, the Bryullov brothers – Alexander Bryullov (professor of architecture) and Karl Bryullov (professor of painting) – taught at the Academy of Arts. Unfortunately, Alexander Bryullov did not leave as much evidence of his pedagogical approach as his other colleagues at the academy (e.g., A.G. Venetsianov, P.V. Basin, and V.K. Shebuev). His educational system can be judged on the basis of his fragmentary sayings and the memories of his disciples.

When K.P. Bryullov joined the academy in 1836 (he remained there until 1849), it caused an extraordinary rise in the number of painters there. According to academic rules, students were free to choose their professor. In 1845, 24 out of the 102 tickets issued by the academy to attend drawing classes belonged to Bryullov's discipline. His tenure as professor is an important milestone in the history of the academic school. The "Bryullov period" at the academy was marked by the introduction of art to a living reality; this was the key to young students' success. Being responsible for historical

painting, Bryullov taught A.A. Agin and T.G. Shevchenko in portraiture and landscape. Bryullov's methods were different from the usual academic procedure. The artist worked at a huge workshop at the academy, and his personal workshop was a continuation of academic classes, where the issues of art were discussed. The course segued from painting to plaster and then to classes for drawing nature. In their last three years of training at the academy, students worked mainly on subject composition and life classes.

Being well educated, Bryullov strove to foster in students a love of reading great Russian and world literature. All of this knowledge complemented his lectures; his vivid, fascinating speech, figurative language, and elocutionary gift made these lectures exceptional: They explained the theory of painting and the value of the great masters of the past – for example, Velázquez, Rubens, Correggio, and Van Dyck. Discussions were held after joint visits with his students to the Hermitage. Bryullov's approach included the process of copying his own works of art (under his direct supervision), though all attempts at subsequent imitation were nipped in the bud. He paid special attention to the study of antiquity, with the requirement that students were to have a knowledge of drawing. He introduced sketches from life; most of his students' works were drawn in either Italian or lead pencil, which was unusual at the time. Bryullov firmly believed that the study of nature was based on sketching. He required his students to draft all their impressions in working albums (sketchbooks). Less attention was paid to composition or mastering of coloristic skill.

Bryullov engaged his students in working on his paintings. He considered this participation as a kind of practice for creating complex multi-figured compositions and portraits. Obviously, "practice" was conducted under his strict supervision and limited mainly to various parts of the costume and setting. He guided students' independent work, showing how to produce varnish and paints, how to prime a canvas, and so on. His workshop gave students a unique opportunity to learn various art techniques, such as monumental painting, decorative painting, watercolor, and sepia.

The versatility of Bryullov's professional knowledge had a beneficial effect on his students' interests. Historical painting occupied the leading place in the Academy of Arts. However, Bryullov tried to support the various aspirations of all of his students: those who were attracted to history painting, those who were taken with genre painting, and those who preferred art history.

Later Developments

In 1834, some time after Preisler's manual was brought out, A.P. Sapozhnikov issued *A Complete Drawing Course*, which became the embodiment of advanced views in the area of universal graphic education (see Sapozhnikov 2003). This was the first textbook compiled by the Russian artist for secondary schools. The handbook has been reprinted over the subsequent two centuries, and there is an up-to-date edition in print today. The book originally described the system developed in the Academy of Arts. The ability to draw lines, to classify shapes, and to divide a line into equal proportions aided in the acquisition of solid skills in the development of hand and eye, which trained the ability to "feel" proportions. According to the classical system of education presented in the textbook, it was necessary to depict geometric shapes in different positions in order to transmit volume.

The method of teaching drawing proposed by A.P. Sapozhnikov is called the “geometric method.” The method’s main aim was to simplify the task by establishing a methodical sequence, constructing an image on a “simple-to-complex” basis. Using the geometric method correctly always provided positive results in mastering the basics of realistic drawing and was the foundation of the academic system of art education.

The basics of this method were laid down in the fifteenth century by the German artist Albrecht Dürer. Today his approach to the analysis of the shape of the head is fundamental to learning and illustrates the essence of the geometric method. The method of analysis and image construction proposed by Dürer had a positive effect on training and was used and evolved in teaching practice training in Russia.

Russian artistic pedagogy of the nineteenth century experienced the impact of advanced pedagogical ideas of that time. For example, Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, who pioneered the introduction of drawing lessons in educational institutions, enjoyed great popularity during this period. Pestalozzi assumed that one must be able to feel the proportions in order to develop the skills of the hands and realized that learning to draw should precede learning handwriting. The elegance of writing lies in the development of the hands and the degree of pressure on the pen. Art teachers also taught children calligraphy; emphasizing the importance of developing technical skills became widespread in Russian schools.

By the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, drawing had become widespread as a general educational course in Russia. A number of theoretical works emerged that proved the necessity of mastering graphics skills and the importance of drawing as a general subject. In 1900 the Imperial Society for the Encouragement of Arts published a book called *The Course of Elementary Drawing*, compiled by the scholar E.A. Sabaneev, director of the drawing school of the society (Sabaneev 1900). It proposed a learning system starting with lines, curves, and so on. A typical example of teaching based on the geometric method is the drawing of a vegetable element, such as a leaf, the shape of which fits into a rectangle divided into two equal parts horizontally and three vertically. Another more specific example is a maple leaf, which is built with the help of a pair of compasses in a truncated circle to the bottom.

The beginning of the twentieth century saw the opening of a new page in the history of the development of methods of teaching drawing. In this period, new views arose on art, school, and forms and methods of teaching. Those who rejected the geometric method could not fully appreciate its value, and drawing itself began to be superseded and replaced by scenic work. The natural method became widespread; the art of the nineteenth century gave impetus to the development of this area. The shift away from the tradition of academic drawing and methods of teaching began under the influence of Impressionism, which violated the clear system of learning previously employed in Russian art pedagogy. The natural approach was introduced by specialists in methods of teaching and school teachers. An illustrative example of the natural approach is described in the book *New Methods in Education: Art, Real Manual Training, Nature Study* (1899), written by an American educator, James Liberty Tadd, whose works were well known in Russia. Initially, the book came out in three editions, but the full and final version was published in 1914. The photographs within the book explain the essence of the natural method in a clear and distinctive way. They show children drawing birds and cats from nature in the same breath – that is, “I draw it in the way I see it.” The pictures they are drawing are of a large size and made with chalk on a blackboard. Tadd

claims that this approach helps to develop both fine and gross motor skills. There are some tasks that require both hands to be used at the same time. The development of fine motor skills is regarded as a necessary skill for both artists and children, whose hand movements should be firm and agile. For instance, in one of the pictures we can see a girl sitting out of doors and drawing a dog on a blackboard with a piece of chalk. In this case, we cannot see any construction lines or geometric compositions. Another photo depicts students who are making sculptures of a dog in the open air. The very core of these tasks is to reflect one's impression and demonstrate one's ability to grasp the particular features of a life model quickly. Another example shows us a girl who is drawing several ellipses in divergent directions. This assignment is essential if one wants to learn how to depict precisely, easily, and quickly various three-dimensional objects, such as cups, saucers, and other round-shaped items.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the question of the pros and cons of the geometric and natural approaches to teaching triggered robust discussions within the academic community. Which method should be chosen as the most appropriate one? The geometric method centered around the idea of simplification of complicated tasks and was based on a "simple-to-complex" approach to the process of image construction. The natural approach to teaching, in turn, was focused on the quick depiction and sensorial perception of objects. Nowadays, the two approaches cannot exist independently and the principles of teaching visual art to children rest upon the combination of these two approaches.

Louis Prang and his *Primary Course in Art Education* played a key role in the history of Russian art education. The book was compiled by Mary Hicks and illustrated by Edith Chadwick (Hicks 1892). In Russia, the last edition of the book was issued in 1911. It covered questions concerning color and form, construction of objects and decorations, clay modeling and paper folding, exemplary drawing and drawing from imagination, painting, observation, and so on. Here we can also find useful information on the drawing of geometric objects and the depiction of three-dimensional shapes. In the book, for the first time ever, we come across so-called "days of paintings" – discussions on art and modeling. In subsequent years, this form of communication with students was included in the Soviet school programs under the title "Conversations about Art," the purpose of which was to enable the student to get the full artistic experience. Moreover, the book contains development drawings and gluing of basic geometric three-dimensional figures, to name but two of its features. Furthermore, it was the first book to consider the variety of art activities that can be undertaken when teaching younger children.

Included in the book are plans for lessons for children aged over 5 as well as for school students (8–18 years), which solved the education continuity problem. If we analyze the nineteenth century's curriculum for primary schools, the only thing we can find is a drawing block – the assignments were done by children with a pencil alone, successively moving from drawing simple lines to depicting three-dimensional figures and plaster models. In academic institutions, where children were taught by professional teachers, the educational process additionally reached the stage of drawing plaster busts. American authors borrowed all of the good traditions of Russian art education as cultivated in Russian art schools, particularly in the Stroganov School (officially the School of Painting Related to Arts and Crafts), which trained specialists to be able to create works of art that met high aesthetic standards. The development of the artistic taste of school graduates became the prerogative of American specialists. They took this approach to art

education as a basis for the whole educational system, which led to the birth of various forms of art activities and expanded the creativity of children.

The *Primary Course in Art Education* handbook and the program it suggested were scrutinized by Russian teachers. The methods used to teach drawing in American schools were presented to the Russian public in such works as *American School* by I. Yanzhul, who traveled abroad to study art education in American schools firsthand. Prang's system consists of three main points that are interconnected and amplified in separate chapters. In the handbook (Hicks 1892), the authors pointed out

three diverse but interconnected things that claim our attention – visualization (the theory and practice of depicting objects in the way we see them), decoration (the theory and practice of ornamentation), and project engineering (the theory and practice of making drafts for the production and construction of different objects). (215)

In Russia, these three considerations were put into action and developed under the supervision of B.M. Nemensky (see Nemensky 1981).

In 1912, a program titled “Drawing at the Initial Stage of Education in Connection with Modeling and Drawing” was developed by the following prominent St. Petersburg specialists in pedagogy: V. Beyer, A. Voskresensky, K. Lepilov, E. Razygraev, V. Saglin, and A. Smirnov. The program included four types of activities related to drawing: drawing from nature; illustrating; decorative (ornamental) drawing (“creating ornaments”); and viewing and reading pictures. Conversations about art, modeling classes, and logic training resulted in the enhancement of children’s perceptions of the basics of drawing. The exercises aimed at fine motor skill development were taken from the book by Tadd (1899), while perspective drawing technique was based on that of Prang (Hicks 1892). The concepts of this program were developed in the first drawing handbooks for primary schools, which were issued in the Soviet Union in the late 1950s. The author (and compiler) of these books was N.N. Rostovtsev, who was quite successful in setting out the methodology of consistent training and the techniques for creating images. The described training began with the development of basic skills. The process of a child’s education included drawing various types of lines, depicting elements of vegetables, drawing from nature, perspective drawing, thematic drawing, experimenting with colors, and getting acquainted with reproductions. The handbooks followed the geometric method and contained visual aids developed by A.P. Sapozhnikov.

The program of the so-called St. Petersburg teachers of drawing is the basis of V.S. Kuzin’s modern-day program entitled “Visual Arts.” This is an up-to-date visual arts program for elementary schools (Grades 1–4) and high schools (Grades 5–9) that is supported by various teaching materials. The program was developed by V.S. Kuzin, S. Lomov, E.V. Shorokhov, S. Ignatev, and others. It is supported by a series of handbooks for Grades 1–4 (authored by V.S. Kuzin and E. Kubishkina) and for Grades 5–6 (authored by S. Lomov, S. Ignatev, and V. Karmazin). The handbooks for Grades 1–4 contain material on each of the four components of an exemplary visual arts program – “Kinds of Art,” “ABCs of Art,” “Art: Meaningful Topics,” and “The Experience of Artistic and Creative Activities’ – and a similar approach is taken for Grades 5–6.

Today, teachers of the visual arts are given the opportunity to choose a variant of the program and its methodological support. For this reason, the subject of “art” is

supported by a number of educational programs and teaching kits developed by various authors. When teachers make their selection, the priority should be given to educational technologies that specifically identify the goals and objectives of training, development, and education.

Concepts Underpinning the Teaching of Fine and Decorative Arts and Design in Russian Educational Establishments since 1900

The abovementioned teaching methods and new editions of textbooks, which were published according to new developments in methodology, were in demand in secondary schools as well as in higher education, where they made up the foundation of the academic pedagogical structure. Higher education in the field of arts is characteristic of unique teaching methods and individual creative concepts, designed by artists, who worked in teaching and were at the forefront of art pedagogy. This section considers six concepts of methodology with regard to the teaching of visual arts in secondary and high schools. These concepts brought together the pedagogical ideas that were at the forefront of their time.

The first concept, “uninhibited education theory,” emerged at the turn of the nineteenth century and was almost immediately rejected at the beginning of the twentieth century. By the 1930s, A.V. Bakushinsky had become a leading theorist in the field of art education for children. He supported the idea of “uninhibited education,” which focused on the assertion of a child’s personality with his or her absolute right to express his or her emotions and thoughts, and on ousting the teacher from the managing position. According to the supporters of this theory, mastering graphic skills is unnecessary, especially during the earliest stages of children’s education. They maintained that secondary schools did not prepare artists, and so there was no need to teach children the rules of realistic drawing. In contrast, according to opponents of the theory, by depriving children of a thorough training in the basics of artistic literacy, this approach left children naive and helpless in the world of arts. The supporters of uninhibited education theory claimed that their approach supported comprehensive student development, but in reality visual arts classes focused on aesthetics.

The second concept, the “school of realistic drawing,” was suggested by N.N. Rostovtsev. Visual arts pedagogy, just like any other field of study, could not develop without influence from the contemporary political and economic situation in Russia. At the end of the 1930s, the issue of teaching painting and drawing became especially controversial and generated interest not only among the artists whose main occupation was arts pedagogy but also among the artists who dedicated themselves to creative work. In addition, the tenseness of relations between different creative directions in contemporary art was reflected in debates on the questions of pedagogy, representative of the viewpoints that different schools had adopted.

From 1935 to 1940, several key works on teaching drawing appeared almost simultaneously: *Drawing Guide*, under the editorship of Kardovsky; *The Problems of Scholarly drawing*, by Professor M.D. Bernstein; *P.P. Chistyakov and His Pedagogical System*, by I. Ginzburg; the *Drawing and Painting Textbook* of the Soviet National Center for Contemporary Art; and a book by N.E. Radlov titled *Painting from Nature*. These works focus

primarily on drawing. The question of teaching painting and composition had not been practically considered. This can be explained by the fact that teaching drawing was more easily systemized and outlined. Thus, the literature on methodology that was published prior to the 1960s focused primarily on drawing, although back in 1912 St. Petersburg specialists and teachers had, as aforementioned, developed a program called “Drawing at the Initial Stage of Education in Connection with Modeling and Drawing.” The logical continuation of children’s education came down to teaching them the basics of technical drawing. Exercises were taken from Tadd’s (1899) book to develop hand movements. The program also featured an illustration of perspective from Prang’s book (Hicks 1892). The geometric method was implemented in the image of a butterfly so as to ensure the butterfly was correctly depicted in a trapeze with the axis of symmetry. The ideas of the program created by St. Petersburg teachers of painting were further developed in the first textbooks on painting for the elementary school by N.N. Rostovtsev, which were published in the Soviet Union in 1957 and 1961. The author’s achievement was in consistently outlining the methodology of teaching and showing how to create an image. The learning process started with developing the skills that a child should master to be able to depict different lines and elements of vegetables. This was followed by lessons on painting from nature, depicting perspective, creating paintings on certain topics, and working with color. This teaching system also included an introduction to the reproduction of some painters’ works. The textbooks used the geometric method and recommended visual guides developed by A.P. Sapozhnikov.

The third concept, named “holistic artistic education,” was developed in the early 1970s by Boris Yusov. The main underlying concept of the framework was students’ understanding, experience, and creation of artistic imagery. The key pillar of the framework was imagery creation, as both the main method and the result of the process of art creation and perception. In Yusov’s program, graphic literacy was the means of creating imagery of various kinds and in various genres of fine art. Graphic literacy had acquired a new meaning, which came from the specificity of language and the ways of creating imagery. To expand, these ways presume various creative means – that is, creating on a plane and in volume, or modeling; creating from nature, memory, or representation; or creating based on fantasy and imagination. A new and important focus was introduced: the aesthetic perception of surrounding reality and art. In his 1984 thesis “Schoolchildren’s Artistic Upbringing and Education,” Yusov theoretically justifies the concept of holistic artistic education (see Yusov 2001).

The fourth concept was the “school of realistic drawing – mastering graphic skills,” which was created by V.S. Kuzin, N.N. Rostovtsev’s follower and associate, and the successor to his scientific ideas. The vision of the research team supervised by Kuzin took shape during the 1970s. According to Kuzin, teaching life classes should be the basis of training, with the aim being to create realistic drawing and master graphic skills. These ideas had already been promoted by Rostovtsev. The basis for creating the program “Visual Art” supervised by Kuzin was the abovementioned program of the so-called St. Petersburg teachers of drawing. Kuzin was the author of textbooks dedicated to the methods of teaching drawing: *The Fundamentals of Teaching Fine Arts at School* (1977), *Drafts and Sketches* (1981), *Teaching Methods of Drawing in Grades 1–3* (1983), *Visual Art and Methods of Its Teaching at School* (1998), *Drawing: Sketches and Drafts* (2004), *Psychology of Painting* (2005), and others. The textbook *Psychology* (1997) deserves close attention as this is where the author sought to conclusively prove that fine arts can

influence psychological development – specifically, personality formation, concentration, cognitive processes, feelings, perception, memory, thinking, speech, and imagination. The program “Fine Arts: Elementary and Secondary School” (by V.S. Kuzin, E.V. Shorokhov, T.Y. Shpikalova, E.I. Kubyshkina, and N.M. Sokolnikova) was published several times; it underwent constant improvements, and significant changes were made in 1999. The program notes that the main aims of art education are concerned with sharing human values and transmitting national cultural heritage. Kuzin’s original program was renewed by his students. The authoring team, supervised by S.P. Lomov, suggested a modern understanding of the program. Nowadays, it is a fine arts program for elementary schools (Grades 1–4) and secondary schools (Grades 5–9) that is delivered using various teaching materials. The authors of the program are V.S. Kuzin, S.P. Lomov, E.V. Shorokhov, S.E. Ignatiev, and others. It is supported by the textbook *Fine Arts: Grades 1–4* by V.S. Kuzin and E.I. Kubyshkina.

The fifth concept, “forming artistic culture as part of intellectual culture,” was developed in the early 1970s under the supervision of B.M. Nemensky. His main idea was to raise awareness of world art heritage. This concept gathered the best ideas in the history of art education (building on the theoretical heritage of P.P. Blonsky, A.V. Bakushinsky, S.T. Shatsky, L.S. Vygotsky, and others), as well as the background of art education in other countries. In this concept, artistic image became an instrument that was used to form students’ artistic culture, and a child’s personality was deemed to be of great importance in the educational process, a perception that led to an intensification of the social functions of art. Prang’s *Primary Course in Art Education* played a key role in the development of this concept as well as in the history of Russian art education.

The sixth concept, “development of emotional–aesthetic relations to the traditional national culture in integrated teaching of art,” is reflected in a program for schools called “Art: Basics of Folk and Decorative Art,” developed by a group of authors under Tamara Shpikalova. In the 1990s, with the growth of a national consciousness and the development of an interest in folk culture, innovative work came to focus on the development of a new section in the program of fine arts dedicated to folk arts and crafts, and national traditions in culture and everyday life. The main task of the program, along with educational and developmental goals, is the involvement of children in national cultural heritage. The program is based on the principle of studying integrated themes: fine art, music, reading, and out-of-class activities. This fine arts program was developed for primary schools (Grades 1–4) and secondary schools (Grades 5–9) and comes with teaching materials. Prosveshcheniye Publishing House has published students’ books for Grades 1–4 on fine arts written by T. Shpikalova and L. Ershov. Currently, many groups of authors continue to improve existing programs in fine arts in accordance with new requirements of the Federal State Educational Standard (GEF). Natalia Sokolnikova developed a program called “Art: Grades 1–4” based on the recent achievements of teaching methodology in the visual arts as well as on the requirements of GEF. This “art” program is based on the visual arts: fine art, folk art, arts and crafts, architecture, and design. The program content is aimed at the implementation of the priority areas of art education: introduction to art as a spiritual experience across the generations, seizing the means of artistic activity, and the development of the creative talent of the child. Astrel Publishing House has issued textbooks and educational materials for this program.

Other Methods and Approaches to Design Teaching

Methods and approaches to design teaching are reflected in a number of scientific–theoretical, teaching, and methodological works, which are considered to be the pedagogical heritage of the first design schools. This section focuses on the most prominent of them.

A new educational institution was opened by Count Stroganov in Moscow in 1825 and was named the School of Painting Related to Arts and Crafts (known colloquially as the Stroganov School). Information about the teaching of the first artists of decorative and applied art and artist-designers can be learned from pre-revolutionary sources. The most significant source among them is profound and thorough research conducted by an assistant professor at Moscow University, historian A.F. Gartvigom, released in 1901 on the 75th anniversary of the school. This work was called *The School of Painting Related to Arts and Crafts* and it was the first volume of a planned series on the period from 1825 to 1860, when the Stroganov School was reorganized. This research became the basis for all further descriptions of the school's activity in the period of time aforementioned and is regarded as an invaluable description of artists' preparation for industrial work at this time.

A more recent exploration of the history of the Stroganov School was carried out at the Research Institute of Theory and History of Fine Arts of the Russian Academy of Arts, resulting in the publication of *The History of the Stroganov School 1825–1918* by E.N. Shulginoy and I.A. Proninoy. It is noteworthy that, in creating the model for the school, Stroganov was guided by the ideas of the Swiss teacher Pestalozzi. Although the basis for the school was taken from already proven European systems of training, these systems were adapted for the representatives of an illiterate artisan class. The teaching program of the Stroganov School was published in Moscow in 1938.

In 1860, after the merger of two drawing schools – the Meshchansky Department, opened in 1833, and the Stroganov Drawing School – and the establishment of the Stroganov School of Technical Drawing, a gradual complication of the process of preparing students began. The teacher of drawing and watercolor M.V. Vasilev wrote a *Textbook for the Initial Training of Elementary Linear and Ornamental Painting* at this time. M.V. Vasilev had developed the best methodological manuals and collections of originals, which formed the basis of a bank of materials used by the school (consisting of original drawings, patterns, use of colors in contouring, use of color shading, and 12 sample exercises in brush painting).

At this time, educational practice consisted of sketching nature, measuring architectural monuments, studying applied and monumental art of ancient Russia, copying patterns of ancient manuscripts, and studying the sculptural decorations of the churches of Vladimir-Suzdal, built in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. All of the materials gathered during this period of time created the basis for the Applied Art Museum in St. Petersburg, opened in 1878, and its collection has subsequently been enriched over many years. Training was improved via the introduction of the possibility of studying Russian and foreign art samples so as to get acquainted with various types of production.

Unfortunately, in the first years after the October Revolution (1917), archival materials about the Stroganov School and huge amounts of methodological material, accumulated over decades, were destroyed. The aforementioned work *The History of the Stroganov School 1825–1918* and others consider the original structure, which developed during

the school's heyday (the late nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century); they also examine the school's flexible educational system, teaching methods of interest, and effective methods of influencing pupils. These methods increased their interest in the mastering of knowledge and skills, and some are applicable to modern education. Some methodological teaching theses of the school have been preserved in the modern practice of design training.

From 1919 to 1929 there was rapid development in design education; this was a period of searching and experimentation. This stage was connected with the opening of the first design school, called VKhUTEMAS-VHUTEIN (the term *vhutein*, meaning "institute," was preferred over "studio," which the school was known as until 1926); its goal was to prepare experts in "industrial art" (in modern terminology, "design"). As a result, a new integrated art–technical higher educational institution was created. Architects, metal-working specialists, painters, graphic designers, sculptors, ceramists, stage designers, fabric designers, woodworkers, and sculptors of monuments were trained there.

The development of design education in Europe is connected with the creation of the Bauhaus, the methodical center of design, in 1919. It united such outstanding masters and teachers as Gropius, Mies van der Rohe, Le Corbusier, Itten, Kandinsky, Mondrian, Klee, and Moholy-Nagy. The educational course at the Bauhaus, for the first time, united art and technical training. Students were guided by the creation of samples for mass production. They discovered the structural properties of a product and found new design concepts. It is evident that the Bauhaus and VKhUTEMAS were in constant contact and were recognized as the leaders of artistic thought in that period; a number of experts gave lessons in the two schools simultaneously. In addition, the two schools stopped their work practically at the same time: VKhUTEMAS was dissolved in 1930 and the Bauhaus was closed in 1933. These educational institutions gave birth to a model of an integrated art–technical university that was unparalleled in history. Both educational institutions possessed a huge pedagogical heritage. For example, the heritage of the Bauhaus had been collected, systematized, and classified for academic analysis. The extent of the pedagogical heritage is made clear by the considerable quantity of publications during that time devoted to the methodologies of the Bauhaus experts, such as Klee, Kandinsky, and Itten. At the same time, the presentation of methodical knowledge in these publications undoubtedly bears the influence of that time. It can be characterized by an emphasis on a creative experiment and an outcome, but the procedure itself was not fully outlined.

For many years, VKhUTEMAS was consigned to oblivion, and only in the 1990s did significant monographic editions appear that were devoted to the analysis of its heritage and the possibility of its methods' practical application. Khan-Magomedov's (1995) monograph *VKhUTEMAS* fully depicts the character and structure of the designers' professional training. In this monograph, the author considers the problematic situation that arose in Russian art during the pre-revolutionary years and also examines the precursors of VKhUTEMAS, which was established on the foundations of the two Moscow art schools: the Stroganov School for Technical Drawing and the Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture.

In the aftermath of the reorganization of the teaching process after the foundation of VKhUTEMAS, many new teachers without any experience started to work. The majority of them – after obtaining a permit to teach and, accordingly, recognition of their own creative individuality – started their own workshops, which were based on their

personal creative experience. They rejected many things that had worked for decades, including the academic method of training. VKhUTEMAS's structure and programs were, in a short space of time, formulated based on these personalized and contradictory workshops. From the variety of issues of this period, one problem is worth mentioning: the materials devoted to the development of a method of "objective teaching" and, building on that, the elaboration of the general introduction to art. The system of introductory disciplines on the base of "objective methods" in teaching was created during the first three years of VKhUTEMAS's existence. The formal-analytical method, pursued by Russian avant-garde artists in the first decades of the twentieth century, became the basis for abstract exercises in the following disciplines: space, volume, color, and drawing. They were studied by all of the students at the most basic level of training. The second level of professional training provided enrollment in one of the eight faculties: architecture, painting, sculpture, metal cutting, woodworking, ceramics, textiles, and polygraphics (graphics). The division of specializations according to the type of material was connected, first, with professional training traditions for applied-art artists in Russia and, second, with the industrial developments of this period.

Later there was a shift from the "objective method" of teaching to construction art. An important part of the process of reforming was played by the Institute of Artistic Culture (INKhUK). The institute was a creative union of Soviet art representatives who all worked on scientific solutions to the main questions of art and the refocusing of ideas from the method of objective analysis to production interests. After a revival in the training of future designers in 1945, there arose an understanding of both the educational conceptions of designers' training and of design itself as a phenomenon; design theory became a separate field of science. Around this time, VNIITE began to regularly publish collections on the topic of art and design education.

There are still a lot of textual documents (e.g., programs) that reflect the teaching methodologies of the various departments of INKhUK and the individual teaching methods of certain professors. These documents have been studied by specialists for many years. Meanwhile, there is still a great deal of work to do on the thorough analysis of numerous methods and academic programs, including comparing them to the programs of different institutions with the goal of discovering something positive that can be used in contemporary times. The ideas and methods of VKhUTEMAS-VHUTEIN gained traction in the publications that appeared in subsequent years, such as D.L. Melodinsky's *Architectural Propaedeutics (History, Theory, Practice)* (2000) and the articles published in *Technical Aesthetics* by VNIITE, which ran between January 1964 and July 1992. In addition, training programs on specialized disciplines have been published, for example by the Moscow State Stroganov Academy of Industrial and Applied Arts. They remain the basis of training in engineering and design.

Some interesting methodological works have been published: *Design Education* (1969–1972), *Leningrad School of Design* (1990), *Moscow School of Design* (1991), *Ural School of Design* (1992), *Kharkov School of Design* (1992), and *Design in an Education System* (1994). Anthologies about national schools of design and approaches to training designers contain materials about the formation of different schools of training, special features, the structure and content of training, and the methods of teaching of the various disciplines.

Among other problems that the design institutions of Russia faced was the absence of books for students. This is explained by the fact that among the teachers at creative

schools there was no tradition of describing their training methods in written forms. Therefore, by the beginning of the 1990s there were almost no pedagogical methods for applied arts and design. Various universities and teachers running their own courses filled this gap. This was followed by the release of teaching manuals by the Stroganov Institute (known as MGKHPU) and the Moscow Architectural Institute (known as MARKHI).

The postinstitutional period, from the 1990s to the present day, has been marked by the start of reforms in all spheres of life, including socioeconomic transformations and rapid technological progress. The radical socioeconomic changes that took place in Russian society in the 1990s, with the transition to a market economy, created a necessity for change in the area of arts pedagogy. The number of art and design universities and departments increased, and the goals and tasks of training were transformed. New tasks are likely to arise for the academics and teachers who are in charge of the quality of arts pedagogy in the coming years.

SEE ALSO: Art and Design Education in Russia; History of Chinese Design Education; “Made in Italy”: The Complex Evolution of Art Education in Italy; Perspectives on German Art Pedagogy; Asian–Chinese Visual Arts Curriculum

References

- Brockhaus, F.A. (1898) *Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary* [in Russian]. St. Petersburg: Publishing House Brockhaus & Efron.
- Hicks, M.D. (1892) *The Prang Primary Course in Art Education: Suggestions for the Use of Form Study, Drawing, and Color*. Boston: Prang Educational Co.
- Khan-Magomedov, S.O. (1995) *VKhUTEMAS* [in Russian]. Moscow: Izd-vo Ladia.
- Melodinsky, D.L. (2000) *Architectural Propaedeutics (History, Theory, Practice)* [in Russian]. Moscow: Editorial URSS.
- Nemensky, B.M. (1981) *Wisdom of Beauty: Issues in Esthetical Education* [in Russian]. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
- Preisler, I. (1795) *Thorough Rules, or A Quick Guide to Drawing Art* [in Russian]. Publisher unknown.
- Rostovtsev, N.N. (1982) *The History of Methods of Teaching Drawing: Russian and Contemporary Art Schools: Manual for Students of the Art Pedagogical Universities of the Department No. 2109 “Drawing, Painting and Labor”* [in Russian]. Moscow: Prosveshenie.
- Sabaneev, E.A. (1900) *The Course of Elementary Drawing* [in Russian]. Moscow: Imperial Society for the Encouragement of Arts.
- Sapozhnikov, A.P. (2003) *A Complete Drawing Course* [in Russian] (ed. V.N. Larionova, 4th ed.). Moscow: Alev.
- Tadd, J.L. (1899) *New Methods in Education: Art, Real Manual Training, Nature Study*. New York: Judd.
- Yusov, B.P. (2001) *The Modern Concept of Educational Area (Art)* [in Russian]. Moscow: Publisher unknown.

Ulyana Aristova holds a doctorate of education and is professor in the School of Design at the National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia, and academic supervisor of the Design master's program. Previously, she graduated from Moscow State Pedagogical University, Russia, and worked as a teacher of drawing, painting, and composition in an art school, becoming head of department and dean of the Faculty of Design. She is the author of over 50 scientific and methodical works, including two monographs. The areas of her expertise include the history of art education, models for training artists and designers in different countries, and new approaches to the creation of standards, textbooks, teaching manuals, and effective teaching methods in painting and art practice.

Liliya Zhilina is a postgraduate student at Moscow State Pedagogical University, Russia, having obtained a PhD in pedagogical sciences mainly in the theories and principles of the university communicative environment in frames of professional language training. Currently she is working as a teacher of foreign languages for the National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia. The areas of her expertise comprise intercultural communication, and theories and practices of modern vocational education, touching the spheres of linguistics, culture, and art. Among her latest publications is "Advertising as a Neologism-Oriented Discourse: A Study of Advertising English and German Languages" (*Cultural World*, 2015).