

## The content of the term of individualization of learning in the context of the history of the development of the idea of individualization in education

*Sergey V. Pavlov*, postgraduate student

*F.M. Dostoevskiy Russian Christian Academy of Humanities, St. Petersburg (Russia)*

E-mail: pvlsergey@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6378-2480>

Received 20.01.2025

Revised 17.02.2025

Accepted 10.03.2025

**Abstract:** In the theory of pedagogy, an uncertainty associated with the content of the term of individualization of education has existed for a long time. Various authors define and use the term of individualization in a variety of senses, often having not nuanced, but fundamental differences. The situation is partly aggravated by the fact that the term is not directly defined in the legislation of the Russian Federation, and the term definition in the Russian Pedagogical Encyclopedia practically borrowed from the Soviet Pedagogical Encyclopedia is incomplete from a historical and methodological point of view. In this paper, by analyzing the stages of development of the idea of individualization of education, the author formulates the content of the term of individualization to solve the problem of existing discrepancies in the definition of this term and the content of individualization in education. The difference in the content of the term of an individual approach and individualization of education is highlighted. The author considers the history of the development of the idea of individualization by the method of historical periodization using the historical-genetic approach, which allows considering the trend towards individualization in education as a dialectical alternative to the traditional teaching system from the moment of the birth of the concept of an individual approach in learning. The creation of the first individualized teaching method by E. Parkhurst, the Dalton plan, is presented as the result of the development of the idea of individualization in education. Obviously, the results obtained do not create a new understanding of the term of individualization in education, but only substantiate scientifically the use of this term with a certain methodological content, which is already used by some educators. The content of the term of individualization in education proposed in the paper allows excluding the existing duplication and confusion of concepts in this area.

**Keywords:** individualization of education; individualization of learning; individual approach; personalization of learning; personification of learning; Dalton plan; Parkhurst.

**For citation:** Pavlov S.V. The content of the term of individualization of learning in the context of the history of the development of the idea of individualization in education. *Evidence-based education studies*, 2025, no. 1, pp. 9–16. DOI: 10.18323/3034-2996-2025-1-60-1.

### INTRODUCTION

In modern pedagogy, a problem of defining the content of the term of individualization of learning exists, despite the fact that this term appeared more than a hundred years ago. The American educator E. Parkhurst was one of the first who used this term in relation to the teaching method she developed, which was called the Dalton plan. The method is based on the principles of freedom, independence and cooperation of students. The essence of the method is in independent work on educational material in organized laboratory classes under the supervision of a teacher, according to an individual curriculum compiled by the student himself, with a general curriculum divided into weekly and monthly parts for monitoring implementation, and the rejection of the class-and-lesson system of teaching. In other words, the transfer of “ready-to-use experience” by the teacher is replaced by the acquisition of “personal experience” by students, and work according to a curriculum “oriented towards the average student” formed by the teacher is replaced by the implementation of a plan that, albeit spontaneously, is formed by the student himself.

The main principle that distinguishes the Dalton plan from the traditional system of education is the adaptation of the parameters of education (pace, load, alternation of subjects) by the student “for himself”.

However, the author herself, being the founder of the world’s first systematically complete method of individualization, did not give a definition of the term itself. Perhaps, therefore, in the pedagogical literature regarding the term of individualization, many versions and different interpretations have appeared which still exist today. Therefore, theoretical studies on the issue of individualization begin with large introductory parts describing the content of this term in the understanding of the author and various educationists. The concepts of individual learning, individual approach and individualization were supplemented by the terms of personalization and/or personification of learning. In addition to the fact that in theoretical works, we see a variety of definitions characterized by different shades of meaning, it is not so rare we observe a mixture or duplication of concepts. In our opinion, the ambiguity of concepts both confuses the development of theoretical thought and

hinders correct and meaningful pedagogical practice, because if even in scientific papers, there is no single point of view, then can we hope for a correct understanding of the essence of concepts by teachers "on the ground"?

Analyzing the technologies of individualized learning, the authors [1] report that "the technology of individualization of learning is built directly on an individual approach, which can be defined as the organization of the educational process based on considering the characteristics of students" [1, p. 209]. Almost the same interpretation is used in the study [2]: "taking into account the individual characteristics of students in the learning process" [2, p. 21] and in the work [3]. It is evident that the authors practically equate the concepts of an individual approach and individualization. However, it is wrong to blame them for this, because they repeat this point of view from the Russian Pedagogical Encyclopedia: "Individualization of learning, organization of the educational process, taking into account the individual characteristics of students"<sup>1</sup>, which, in turn, almost repeats the definition of individualization from the Soviet Pedagogical Encyclopedia of 1965. It is not surprising that the majority of Soviet, and later Russian, educationists perceived individualization as an individual approach, sometimes even without mentioning collective learning, although it is difficult to explain why the theoretical apparatus of science needs a second term denoting the same thing.

Another confusion of concepts sometimes occurs between differentiation and individualization of learning [4], which ideologically goes back to the point of view of I.M. Osmolovskaya: "Individualization is an extreme case of differentiation" [5, p. 7] defining the differences between approaches only as quantitative.

Since individualization of learning in the interpretation of the Soviet, and later Russian, encyclopedia was reduced to an individual approach, a separate concept was needed to describe the active role of the student in the process of forming learning parameters. Zh.A. Abalyan, considering the genesis of the term of personalization in education, points to its coming from psychology, as well as to the use of the term of personalization of education by A.V. Khutorsky (possibly for the first time. – note by author), N.N. Surtaeva, P.V. Sysoev, S.A. Vdovina, and the term of personification of education – by N.E. Ogarev [6]. In 2005, V.V. Grachev wrote, "The idea of personalization runs like a golden thread through the formation of many innovative educational models... a personality-oriented approach, subject-subject interaction" [7, p. 15].

Gradually, a version has emerged in the theoretical pedagogical space that individualization of learning is the adaptation of learning parameters "for the student" carried out by the teacher, and personification (personalization) of learning is the adaptation of learning parameters carried out by the student [8; 9].

Considering the idea of developing individualization as a historical prerequisite for personalized learning, the authors [10] supplement the concept of personification

with essential characteristics, such as the tutoring role of the teacher and the personally significant goals of the student. In [11], analyzing higher education in modern conditions, the authors clearly demonstrate an example of confusion between the concepts of personification and individualization. First, they assert that individualization, like personification, "positions the student as the main subject of educational activity" [11, p. 111], and then provide a table of differences between personalization and individualization, from which, it follows that with individualization of education, the student is an object in the educational process, and with personalization, he is an active subject.

Defining the essential characteristics of personification, the authors of the study [12] highlight among them the formation of a personalized educational environment addressed to the interests and needs of an individual student. Developing this approach in [13], they consider personalized learning as a new didactic principle in the postnonclassical understanding, when the subjectification of the student's role in the pedagogical process is supplemented with the axiological content of the value of interaction in the educational environment.

However, when describing pedagogical innovations, not all authors use the personalization-personification terminology to describe subject-subject relations in the pedagogical process. Many of them do with the term individualization, considering it exhaustive, for example, when analyzing the practice of individualization in modern pedagogical education [14]; when considering the psychological aspects of the relationship between the mechanisms of consciousness and individualization of learning [15]; when studying the problem of subjectification in the individualization of learning [16]. The examples given demonstrate the conceptual duplication in the individualization and personification terms used by researchers. This duplication of terms is recorded in the models of R.V. Komarov and T.M. Kovaleva [17].

Summarizing the review of studies, we see that the problem of confusing the concepts of an individual approach and individualization of learning, on the one hand, and individualization of learning and personification (personalization) of learning, on the other, requires resolution.

The aim of this study is to show that from a historical, essential and axiological point of view, the exclusion of the active subjective role of the student from the concept of individualization of learning is unreasonable, as is the reduction of the concept of individualization of learning to an individual approach.

## METHODS

The logic of the study is based on the analysis of the evolution of the idea of individualization of education from the moment of its origin in the ancient period in the form of the idea of an individual approach to education to the moment of its implementation in the first individualized method of teaching – the Dalton plan, through periods of regression in the Middle Ages, revival through humanism in the Renaissance, development of naturalistic preferences in the Enlightenment, and proclamation of pedagogical ideas of "free development" and "personal experience" as a condition for the formation of an individual

<sup>1</sup> Davydov V.V., ed. *Rossiyskaya pedagogicheskaya entsiklopediya [Russian Encyclopedia of Pedagogics]*. Moscow, *Bolshaya Rossiyskaya entsiklopediya Publ.*, 1993. Vol. 1, 607 p. P. 358–607.

in the industrial era. The study was conducted using the historical-genetic method and the method of historical periodization, guided by the principles of objectivity and relying on historical sources. The evolution of the idea of individualization is considered as the development of an alternative branch of pedagogy in its dialectical opposition to traditional views on pedagogy at all stages.

## RESULTS

### The ancient period

The term of individualization of learning appeared only about a hundred years ago, but an individual approach in education and upbringing has occupied the minds of educators since the origin of pedagogy. Even the ancient Roman theorist of oratory and educator Marcus Fabius Quintilian (1<sup>st</sup> century AD), devoting Chapter IX of his Rhetorical Instructions to an individual approach to students, spoke of the need to "charge the teacher with a virtue... to distinct the natural abilities of students."<sup>2</sup>

Many thinkers addressed the topic of an individual approach in education, although they intended different meanings and content of this concept. The idea of individualization in education itself was formed in several stages before it acquired its current content. One of the first meanings on the path to individualization in education was the necessity of seeing in the student, first, an individual with his own rights and dignity. Even this was not obvious in the era when the rod was considered the main means of persuasion and punishment of the student. In the ancient period of history, physical punishment was also a common thing. It is not surprising that M.F. Quintilian, who proclaimed the principle of an individual approach, unequivocally rejected physical punishment of pupils, "I do not approve of the custom of punishing children physically, although this is accepted by almost everyone... Such punishment seems to me vile and is characteristic only of slaves."<sup>3</sup> Thus, the humanization of education is the first stage, the prerequisite for an individual approach to the student.

### Middle Ages. Renaissance

In the Middle Ages that followed the ancient period, with its dominant religious content in all spheres of society, including education, the idea of humanizing education was initially rejected. This was primarily due to the dogmas of the Old Testament, which is the canonical origin of a belief for Christians. For example, in the Solomon's Proverbs, "Whoever spares the rod hates his son, but he who loves him is diligent to discipline him" (Proverbs 13:25). Many Christian thinkers up to the beginning of the 20th century – Augustine Aurelius (5<sup>th</sup> century AD), Ambrose of Milan (4<sup>th</sup> century AD), Peter Damascene (12<sup>th</sup> century AD), A.P. Lopukhin (1852–1904) in the Explanatory Bible, and

Vissarion Nechaev (1823–1905) repeated subsequently this idea, and only with the advent of the Renaissance, the idea of humanizing education returned to pedagogical thought and practice. Anthropocentrism was proclaimed the ideal of the Renaissance, man and human life – the main value, and although, of course, several more centuries had to pass before this ideal was implemented, in the pedagogical ideas of the Renaissance, along with art, this was reflected. Vittorino da Feltre founded the House of Joy School (1423), the activities of which were based on the principle of respect for the personal dignity of students; Francois Rabelais (1494–1553) came out with the idea of comprehensive harmonious development of a child and criticism of the existing system of education described in the Gargantua and Pantagruel novel.

Michel de Montaigne (1533–1592) both continued the ideas of humanism in education, "Go into such a college during classes: you will hear nothing but cries – the cries of schoolchildren being flogged, and the cries of teachers... Is it possible to awaken in children a desire for study in this way...? A false and destructive method!"<sup>4</sup>, and, perhaps for the first time, proclaimed the principle of the subjectivity of the pupil, which is today included in the concept of individualization. Montaigne calls for giving a child the opportunity to show his inclinations, "allowing him to find the road himself," and for the mentor "to also listen to his pupil"<sup>5</sup>.

The Renaissance humanists, paying attention to the individuality of students, called for the need to consider their characteristics in the process of education, rejecting the medieval impersonal, often cruel methods of influencing students. The romantic perception of a student as an individual in the Renaissance was the first step towards realizing the value of an individual approach in education and upbringing and was an alternative branch of the established view of the educational system.

Pedagogy began its development with individual teaching, when a teacher worked with one or several students, but an individual approach was usually not used. It was naturally believed that there is knowledge that must be mastered by a student, and there are some methods that convey the essence of this knowledge to the student, and how the student will be able to perceive this knowledge is exclusively a problem of his abilities and hard work. First of all, this was a consequence of the inaccessibility of education and the limited demand for the level of education in the Middle Ages. Human intellectual resources had limited use: to satisfy the intellectual needs of that time, it was enough to educate the capable and rich, so education covered mainly the elite and the clergy.

In the Middle Ages, as the production forces developed in Europe, the demand for education grew. At the same time, two opposing religious movements, Catholicism and Protestantism, opened schools to expand their influence. The increased demand for education gave rise to new trends in pedagogy aimed at organizing mass flow education in the form of a class-and-lesson system, which were

<sup>2</sup> Kvintilian M.F. *Dvenadtsat knig Ritoricheskikh nastavleniy [Twelve books of rhetoric guidelines]*. Sankt Petersburg, tipografiya Imperatorskoy Rossiyskoy Akademii Publ., 1834. 486 p. P. 117.

<sup>3</sup> Kvintilian M.F. *Dvenadtsat knig Ritoricheskikh nastavleniy [Twelve books of rhetoric guidelines]*. Sankt Petersburg, tipografiya Imperatorskoy Rossiyskoy Akademii Publ., 1834. 486 p. P. 29.

<sup>4</sup> Montaigne M. *Opyty. Izbrannye glavy [The Essays. Selected chapters]*. Moscow, Pravda Publ., 1991. 656 p.

<sup>5</sup> Montaigne M. *Opyty. Izbrannye glavy [The Essays. Selected chapters]*. Moscow, Pravda Publ., 1991. 656 p. P. 121.

generalized and formulated by Jan Amos Comenius (1592–1670), who laid the foundation for mass school for several centuries to come. Despite the fact that J.A. Comenius, being a son of the Renaissance, continued the humanization of pedagogy, proclaiming the slogan "Children are the most precious heritage of God and an inestimable treasure"<sup>6</sup>, education in the class-and-lesson system itself in most cases deprived teachers of the opportunity of individual approach to the education of students. The class-and-lesson system primarily solved the problem of maximizing the volume of education with limited pedagogical resources and opened the prospect of mass universal education for centuries to come. Moreover, the class-and-lesson system to a significant extent systematized the learning process and the knowledge acquired by students, and thanks to this it later became the main classical, subsequently recognized traditional, direction of education.

### The Age of Enlightenment

A dialectical alternative to education according to the class-and-lesson system with the help of formed programs that do not differentiate between students arose thanks to the adherents of the "romantic" trend, who believed that education and upbringing should be adapted to a specific student. During the Age of Enlightenment, a prominent representative of this trend was Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778). He laid the foundation for romantic naturalism, which proclaimed that children develop in accordance with a special natural plan created by nature, and the task of the teacher and educator is not to interfere with the implementation of this plan, creating the conditions and prerequisites for its maximum embodiment. He proclaimed, "Childhood has its own, inherent ways of seeing, thinking and feeling; there is nothing more absurd than the desire to replace them with ours."<sup>7</sup>

Of course, this message is quite idealistic, even today, its implementation looks fantastic for mass application, but it set a certain alternative trajectory for the development of pedagogy. The followers of traditional education were improving programs and teaching methods and formulating general goals of education that were in demand by society, scaling education to various, new layers of the population. The followers of the individual approach were formulating concepts that would be in demand when pedagogy would begin to move from the slogan of universal education of the population (which was proclaimed by the Renaissance humanists and which would be implemented in developed countries at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century) to the modern idea of revealing the abilities of each student<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Comenius J.A. *Materinskaya shkola [School of Infancy]*. Moscow, Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatelstvo ministerstva prosveshcheniya Publ., 1947. 103 p. P. 35.

<sup>7</sup> Rousseau J.-J. *Emil, ili O vospitanii [Emile, or On Education]*. Sankt Petersburg, Izdatelstvo gazety Shkola i Zhizn Publ., 1912. 491 p. P. 68.

<sup>8</sup> Medvedev D.A. *Address of the President of Russia to Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation dated November 12, 2009. Prezident Rossii*. URL: <http://www.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/5979>.

### Industrial era

The followers of romantic naturalism, and later of "free development" were not only theorists, like J.-J. Rousseau. A bright practical implementer of this idea was the Italian educator Maria Montessori (1870–1952). She embodied these ideas in specific methods of development and education of children, the main provisions of which were based on the fact that each child is a unique, inimitable personality with its own plan of development, and it is necessary to adapt the process of education to the process of self-development. She wrote, "A child can reveal himself to us only by himself, freely implementing his natural plan of construction"<sup>9</sup>; "Freedom is the only means that always leads to the most complete character development"<sup>10</sup>.

In Russia, a bright representative of the "free development" direction in pedagogy was the great Russian writer Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy (1828–1910), who developed these ideas in the school he opened for peasant children in Yasnaya Polyana. L.N. Tolstoy proposed to provide the student with complete freedom "to perceive the teaching that corresponds to his demand, which he wants, and to perceive as much as he needs, as much as he wants, and to avoid the teaching that he does not need and which he does not want"<sup>11</sup>. Of course, such a radical understanding of "free development" can hardly be considered rational; rather, we evaluate it as a dialectical challenge, the extreme opposite of the conservative traditional approach in pedagogy, where every action of the student is prescribed and controlled by the teacher, where the student is a powerless passive object of the educational and upbringing process.

It took many centuries for human society to reach the level at which the state guaranteed compulsory education. This goal was achieved in the leading countries of the world at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, but the scientific and technological revolution required a higher level of education. Civilization gradually came to the idea that the most valuable economic resource is human capital, an integral part of which is the level of education [18]. The task of not just giving some education to everyone became relevant, but trying to use the existing human potential as efficiently as possible, giving the maximum possible education to those capable, striving to fully use those individual gifts and abilities that each member of society has. This means that education should be built in such a way as to reveal these individual abilities. Maybe, this idea itself is not new, but earlier in its history, humanity did not experience a deficit of intellectual resources, which began to arise everywhere in the 20<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries, especially in the post-industrial era, even despite the rapid growth of the planet's population, which, moreover, no longer affected developed countries.

<sup>9</sup> Montessori M. *Deti – drugie [The Secret of Childhood]*. Moscow, Karapuz Publ., 2004. 334 p. P. 28.

<sup>10</sup> Montessori M. *Samovospitanie i samoobuchenie v nachalnoy shkole [Self-improvement and Self-education at Elementary School]*. Moscow, Karapuz Publ., 2009. 200 p. P. 36.

<sup>11</sup> Tolstoy L.N. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy. Pedagogicheskie stati 1860–1863 [Complete collection of works. V. 8. Pedagogical articles 1860–1863]*. Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya literatura Publ., 1936. Vol. 8, 664 p. P. 155.



The response to this challenge was the progressive trends in pedagogy striving for qualitative shifts in the level of education. One of such approaches in pedagogy was the focus on the "personal experience" of a student as opposed to the "ready-to-use experience" that dominates in traditional schools, transmitted by a teacher to a student. The main initiator of this idea was the American educator John Dewey (1859–1952), "Experience, even the smallest, is capable of generating and supporting even the most complex theory, but theory, unlike experience, cannot even be formulated properly."<sup>12</sup> J. Dewey speaks not simply about experience, but about "active" experience, in which the student must actively act, and not just passively experience, "Experience inextricably combines attempts to act and living through the consequences of these attempts. Separating the stage of active action from the stage of passive living through its consequences, we destroy the vital meaning of experience."<sup>13</sup> This approach in pedagogy, in addition to the well-known focus on the labor school, also laid the foundations for perceiving the student as a subject of the educational process, a paradigm that is today officially accepted as a standard of education in the world and in Russia within the framework of the system-activity approach<sup>14</sup>. The same principle of active personal experience, as we will see below, was the basis for the creation of the world's first system of individualized learning.

### Dalton plan

The first implementations of the pedagogical idea of an individual approach in collective learning historically took place in America during the life of J. Dewey. Several similar teaching methods were proposed, which attempted to introduce individualized principles into school education with the class-and-lesson system. These are the Pueblo Plan (1888–1893) of the American educator P. Search in the city of Pueblo, the North Denver Plan (1898) of D. Van Sinkel, and the most famous systematically developed method of individualization of education was the teaching method called the Dalton Plan (1919). It was created and implemented by the American educator Elena Parkhurst and is still used in many schools around the world today. Justifying her teaching system, E. Parkhurst pointed to two principles underlying it: freedom in educational activity, realized by the student, and the construction of education based on individual and social experience<sup>15</sup>. These principles reflect the history of the development of the ideas of individualization – from the perception of a student as an individual and a person to the free self-realization of their individuality by students in the learning process. E. Parkhurst herself was

a student of courses and assistant of M. Montessori in Italy in 1914<sup>16</sup> and a follower of the ideas of J. Dewey<sup>17</sup>.

Analyzing education on the Dalton plan in terms of the content of the individualization principle embedded in it, we come to the conclusion that individualization, according to E. Parkhurst, contains an individual approach when studying in a general (or differentiated by levels) program through the independent construction of an individual curriculum by the student. In other words, the active subjective role of the student in the process of formulating the parameters of his/her training is an obligatory component in individualized education. What else is necessary for the term voiced by E. Parkhurst and implemented in practice by her in the principles described above to become a generally accepted definition of individualization of education? In addition to the fact that this is logical, it is also fair in relation to the merits of the great educator. At the same time, we see that the idea of individualization of education has gone through several stages in its evolution from the idea of an individual approach, and it is historically unreliable and essentially incorrect to draw an equal sign between them.

From the given historical insight on the development of the idea of individualization, it is clear that individualization of education itself is an alternative paradigm in education and is probably a reflection of the trend towards individualization of a person in society [18].

### DISCUSSION

Based on the results of our study, we conclude that the definition of individualization of learning given in the Russian and Soviet Pedagogical Encyclopedias is incomplete. It is advisable to supplement its content with the need for an active subjective role of the student or the need for a systemic-activity approach enshrined in the Federal State Educational Standards of General Education. The reasons for the disappearance of this content from the concept of individualization of learning in the Soviet encyclopedia may lie in the unsuccessful attempt to introduce the Dalton plan in Soviet Russia in the 1920s and the negative attitude of Soviet ideology towards individualism, but this is a topic for a separate study. As a result of the restriction of the concept of individualization of learning, the term of personification appeared. It was borrowed from psychology and filled with the content lost by the term of individualization, which we saw in the works [8; 9; 11], and the term of individualization of learning itself was devalued to the concept of an individual approach, as was done in studies [1–3]. With our research, we call not to replace the concept of individualization with the concept of personification, but to fill the term of personification with new pedagogical principles complementing or separating it from the term of individualization. We have observed such attempts in

<sup>12</sup> Dewey J. *Demokratiya i obrazovanie [Democracy and Education]*. Moscow, Pedagogika-Press Publ., 2000. 382 p. P. 138.

<sup>13</sup> Dewey J. *Demokratiya i obrazovanie [Democracy and Education]*. Moscow, Pedagogika-Press Publ., 2000. 382 p. P. 144.

<sup>14</sup> Federal State Educational Standard. Approved by order of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation dated May 31, 2021 No. 287 par. 4. Garant.ru: Legal information system. URL: <https://www.garant.ru/products/ipo/prime/doc/401333920/>.

<sup>15</sup> Parkhurst E. *Vospitanie i obuchenie po Daltonskomu planu [Education on the Dalton Plan]*. Moscow, Novaya Moskva Publ., 1924. 232 p. P. 19–20.

<sup>16</sup> Parkhurst E. *Vospitanie i obuchenie po Daltonskomu planu [Education on the Dalton Plan]*. Moscow, Novaya Moskva Publ., 1924. 232 p. P. 15.

<sup>17</sup> Parkhurst E. *Vospitanie i obuchenie po Daltonskomu planu [Education on the Dalton Plan]*. Moscow, Novaya Moskva Publ., 1924. 232 p. P. 20.

the works [12; 13]. Otherwise, it is necessary to abandon the practice of using it, as the authors of [14–16] did. With our work, we do not simply state the mutual intersection of the content of concepts, as the authors of [17] did, but we provide arguments contributing to the ordering of the basic terminology, which should have a positive effect on the theoretical basis of science and facilitate its meaningful application by practicing teachers. We believe that cluttering up the science with new terms instead of filling it with new entities does not contribute to the development of the theoretical base even in the conditions of postnonclassical rationality, but turns theory into a table littered with papers, where it is impossible to find an important document at the right moment.

## CONCLUSIONS

The results of the conducted research show that the term of individualization of learning has historically grown from the concept of an individual approach, supplemented with a new meaning, in particular the active subjective role of the student, and should not be confused with it. At the same time, in this meaning, the term of individualization of learning is meaningfully duplicated by the term personification (personalization) of learning, which came into use much later and, therefore, has no historical right to replace it. The content of the term of personification should be filled not with shades of meaning of the concepts of individualization, but with qualitatively new entities.

## REFERENCES

- Vaganova O.I., Pavlova E.S., Shagalova O.G., Voronina I.R. Technology of individualization of training. *Baltiyskiy gumanitarnyy zhurnal*, 2020, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 208–211. DOI: [10.26140/bgz3-2020-0902-0051](https://doi.org/10.26140/bgz3-2020-0902-0051).
- Koryagina O.V. Individualization of training under conditions of comprehensive school. *The Scientific heritage*, 2019, no. 42-4, pp. 20–2. EDN: [CNFAED](https://www.edn.ru/CNFAED).
- Gazimova T.R. Definition of the content of the concepts of "individual approach to learning" and "individualization of learning". *Nauchnye trudy Moskovskogo gumanitarnogo universiteta*, 2021, no. 5, pp. 17–22.
- Zima V.A., Kolesnikova T.V., Selyukova E.A. Individualization and differentiation of education in primary school in the context of the implementation of the federal state educational standard of the primary education. *Mir nauki, kultury, obrazovaniya*, 2021, no. 3, pp. 66–68. DOI: [10.24412/1991-5497-2021-388-66-68](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2021-388-66-68).
- Osmolovskaya I.M. Differentiated training: some issues of theory and practice. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta. Seriya: Pedagogika*, 1999, no. 5, pp. 6–12.
- Abalyan Zh.A. Personalized approach in learning process. Retrospective analysis and review of modern definitions. *Mir nauki, kultury, obrazovaniya*, 2024, no. 1, pp. 249–252. DOI: [10.24412/1991-5497-2024-1104-249-252](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2024-1104-249-252).
- Grachev V.V. Personification of formation as the answer to global calls of the present. *Akmeologiya*, 2005, no. 2, pp. 11–16. EDN: [PAQHZL](https://www.edn.ru/PAQHZL).
- Pisarenko I.A., Kostina L.M., Karpova M.A. The problem of individualization and personalization of education in scientific research. *Gumanitarnaya paradigma*, 2024, no. 3, pp. 6–13. EDN: [WZJAEG](https://www.edn.ru/WZJAEG).
- Dikikh E.R. Personification as the principle of the implementation of the hybrid teaching. *Izvestiya Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta*, 2022, no. 9, pp. 35–39. EDN: [DMLRVU](https://www.edn.ru/DMLRVU).
- Ilina S.P., Tsimmermann N.V. Evolution idea of individualization of education as a historical prerequisite of personalized learning. *Chelovek i obrazovanie*, 2020, no. 4, pp. 57–63. EDN: [CMGQSS](https://www.edn.ru/CMGQSS).
- Ozarnov R.V., Kazanchyan K.P. Individualization and personalization training in present day higher school. *Mezhdunarodnyy nauchnyy zhurnal*, 2022, no. 3, pp. 110–117. EDN: [NPZCWD](https://www.edn.ru/NPZCWD).
- Aksenova A.Yu., Primchuk N.V. Essential characteristics of personalization of learning: environmental approach. *Chelovek i obrazovanie*, 2020, no. 4, pp. 43–49. EDN: [MCIPEG](https://www.edn.ru/MCIPEG).
- Aksenova A.Yu., Primchuk N.V. Principles for personification of the educational process in post-nonclassical didactics (anthropological-axiological approach). *Chelovek i obrazovanie*, 2022, no. 1, pp. 177–186. EDN: [CENEKX](https://www.edn.ru/CENEKX).
- Neumoeva-Kolchedantseva E.V. Experience and prospects of individualization of modern pedagogical education in the context of practice. *Obrazovatelnye tekhnologii*, 2019, no. 4, pp. 36–48. EDN: [IVPJXE](https://www.edn.ru/IVPJXE).
- Guslyakova A.V., Guslyakova N.I., Vetkhova M.Yu., Kirsanov V.M. Psychological aspects of the relationship of consciousness mechanisms and individualization of learning. *Pedagogika i psikhologiya obrazovaniya*, 2019, no. 4, pp. 172–185. DOI: [10.31862/2500-297X-2019-4-172-185](https://doi.org/10.31862/2500-297X-2019-4-172-185).
- Leskova I.A. The problem of individualization of learning in the context of change of paradigm bases. *Vestnik Mininskogo universiteta*, 2023, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 1–17. DOI: [10.26795/2307-1281-2023-11-2-1](https://doi.org/10.26795/2307-1281-2023-11-2-1).
- Komarov R.V., Kovaleva T.M. Personalization of the educational process: 3D space of interpretations. *Vestnik MGPU. Seriya: Pedagogika i psikhologiya*, 2021, no. 1, pp. 8–21. EDN: [TNSPKP](https://www.edn.ru/TNSPKP).
- Ikonnikova O.V. Development of the human capital theory: socio-historical and economic aspects. *Problemy sovremennoy ekonomiki*, 2012, no. 4, pp. 443–446. EDN: [PZHCHH](https://www.edn.ru/PZHCHH).
- Rozin V.M. Conditions for conceivability of individualization within the new paradigm of education. *Pedagogika i prosveshchenie*, 2020, no. 4, pp. 161–172. DOI: [10.7256/2454-0676.2020.4.34347](https://doi.org/10.7256/2454-0676.2020.4.34347).

## СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

- Ваганова О.И., Павлова Е.С., Шагалова О.Г., Воронина И.П. Технология индивидуализации обучения // Балтийский гуманитарный журнал. 2020. Т. 9. № 2. С. 208–211. DOI: [10.26140/bgz3-2020-0902-0051](https://doi.org/10.26140/bgz3-2020-0902-0051).
- Корягина О.В. Индивидуализация обучения в условиях общеобразовательной школы // The Scientific heritage. 2019. № 42-4. С. 20–22. EDN: [CNFAED](https://www.edn.ru/CNFAED).

3. Газимова Т.Р. Определение содержания понятий «индивидуальный подход в обучении» и «индивидуализация обучения» // Научные труды Московского гуманитарного университета. 2021. № 5. С. 17–22.
4. Зима В.А., Колесникова Т.В., Селюкова Е.А. Индивидуализация и дифференциация образования в начальной школе в условиях реализации ФГОС НОО // Мир науки, культуры, образования. 2021. № 3. С. 66–68. DOI: [10.24412/1991-5497-2021-388-66-68](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2021-388-66-68).
5. Осмоловская И.М. Дифференцированное обучение: некоторые вопросы теории и практики // Вестник Томского государственного педагогического университета. Серия: Педагогика. 1999. № 5. С. 6–12.
6. Абалян Ж.А. Персонализированный подход в обучении: ретроспективный анализ и обзор современных определений // Мир науки, культуры, образования. 2024. № 1. С. 249–252. DOI: [10.24412/1991-5497-2024-1104-249-252](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2024-1104-249-252).
7. Грачев В.В. Персонализация образования как ответ на глобальные вызовы современности // Акмеология. 2005. № 2. С. 11–16. EDN: [PAQHZL](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2005-11-16).
8. Писаренко И.А., Костина Л.М., Карпова М.А. Проблема индивидуализации и персонализации образования в научных исследованиях // Гуманитарная парадигма. 2024. № 3. С. 6–13. EDN: [WZJAEG](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2024-1104-249-252).
9. Диких Э.Р. Персонализация как принцип реализации гибридного обучения // Известия Волгоградского государственного педагогического университета. 2022. № 9. С. 35–39. EDN: [DMLRVU](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2022-9-35-39).
10. Ильина С.П., Циммерманн Н.В. Развитие идеи индивидуализированного образования, как историческая предпосылка персонализированного обучения // Человек и образование. 2020. № 4. С. 57–63. EDN: [CMGOSS](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2020-4-57-63).
11. Озарнов Р.В., Казанчян К.П. Индивидуализация и персонализация обучения в высшей школе в современных условиях // Международный научный журнал. 2022. № 3. С. 110–117. EDN: [NPZCWD](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2022-3-110-117).
12. Аксенова А.Ю., Примчук Н.В. Сущностные характеристики персонализации обучения: средовой подход // Человек и образование. 2020. № 4. С. 43–49. EDN: [MCIPEG](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2020-4-43-49).
13. Аксенова А.Ю., Примчук Н.В. Принципы персонализации образовательного процесса в постнеклассической дидактике (антрополого-аксиологический подход) // Человек и образование. 2022. № 1. С. 177–186. EDN: [CENEKX](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2022-1-177-186).
14. Неумоева-Колчеданцева Е.В. Опыт и перспективы индивидуализации современного педагогического образования в контексте практики // Образовательные технологии. 2019. № 4. С. 36–48. EDN: [IVPJXE](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2019-4-36-48).
15. Гусякова А.В., Гусякова Н.И., Ветхова М.Ю., Кирсанов В.М. Психологические аспекты взаимосвязи механизмов сознания и индивидуализации обучения // Педагогика и психология образования. 2019. № 4. С. 172–185. DOI: [10.31862/2500-297X-2019-4-172-185](https://doi.org/10.31862/2500-297X-2019-4-172-185).
16. Лескова И.А. Проблема индивидуализации обучения в контексте смены парадигмальных оснований // Вестник Мининского университета. 2023. Т. 11. № 2. С. 1–17. DOI: [10.26795/2307-1281-2023-11-2-1](https://doi.org/10.26795/2307-1281-2023-11-2-1).
17. Комаров Р.В., Ковалева Т.М. Персонализация образовательного процесса: 3D-пространство интерпретаций // Вестник МГПУ. Серия: Педагогика и психология. 2021. № 1. С. 8–21. EDN: [TNSPKP](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2021-1-8-21).
18. Иконникова О.В. Развитие теории человеческого капитала: общественно-историческое и экономические аспекты // Проблемы современной экономики. 2012. № 4. С. 443–446. EDN: [PZHCH](https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2012-4-443-446).
19. Розин В.М. Условия мыслимости индивидуализации в новой парадигме образования // Педагогика и просвещение. 2020. № 4. С. 161–172. DOI: [10.7256/2454-0676.2020.4.34347](https://doi.org/10.7256/2454-0676.2020.4.34347).

## Содержание термина индивидуализации обучения в контексте истории развития идеи индивидуализации в образовании

*Павлов Сергей Валерьевич*, аспирант

*Русская христианская гуманитарная академия им. Ф.М. Достоевского, Санкт-Петербург (Россия)*

E-mail: [pvlsergey@mail.ru](mailto:pvlsergey@mail.ru)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6378-2480>

Поступила в редакцию 20.01.2025

Пересмотрена 17.02.2025

Принята к публикации 10.03.2025

**Аннотация:** В теории педагогики продолжительное время существует неопределенность, связанная с содержанием термина индивидуализации образования. Различные авторы определяют и употребляют термин индивидуализации в разнообразных смыслах, зачастую имеющих не оттеночные, а принципиальные расхождения. Ситуация отчасти усугубляется тем, что в законодательной базе Российской Федерации термин прямо не определяется, а определение термина в Российской педагогической энциклопедии, практически заимствованное из Советской педагогической энциклопедии, является с исторической и методологической точки зрения неполным. В работе путем анализа этапов развития идеи индивидуализации образования формулируется содержание термина индивидуализации для решения проблемы существующих разночтений в определении этого термина и содержании индивидуализации в обучении. Выделено различие в содержании термина индивидуального подхода и индивидуализации обучения. История развития идеи индивидуализации рассматривается методом исторической периодизации с использованием историко-генетического подхода, позволяющего рассматривать тренд на индивидуализацию в образовании как диалектическую альтернативу системе традиционного обучения с момента зарождения понятия индивидуального подхода в обучении. Создание Е. Паркхерст первого индивидуализированного метода обучения,

Дальтон-плана, представлено как итог развития идеи индивидуализации в образовании. Полученные результаты, естественно, не создают нового понимания термина индивидуализации в образовании, а лишь научно обосновывают использование этого термина с определенным методологическим наполнением, который уже применяется частью педагогов. Предложенное в статье наполнение содержания термина индивидуализации в образовании позволяет исключить существующее дублирование и смешение понятий в этой области.

**Ключевые слова:** индивидуализация образования; индивидуализация обучения; индивидуальный подход; персонализация обучения; персонификация обучения; Дальтон-план; Паркхерст.

**Для цитирования:** Павлов С.В. Содержание термина индивидуализации обучения в контексте истории развития идеи индивидуализации в образовании // Доказательная педагогика, психология. 2025. № 1. С. 9–16. DOI: 10.18323/3034-2996-2025-1-60-1.