

## Methodological aspects of school education improvement in Ukraine (the second half of the XIX – early XX centuries)

**Vykhruhch Nataliya<sup>1</sup>**

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Lviv, Ukraine

E-mail: [nataliia.vykhruhch@lnu.edu.ua](mailto:nataliia.vykhruhch@lnu.edu.ua)

ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8489-7964>

---

*The process of methodological search in the field of school education is continuous and is based on the analysis of historical experience and modern requirements of society to the level of school education. Under such conditions, a retrospective study of methodological aspects of school education in Ukraine becomes especially significant for pedagogical science. The article summarizes the methodological approaches to teaching the humanities and sciences in secondary schools of Ukraine in the second half of the XIX – early XX centuries. The analysis of positive and negative consequences of using different methodological approaches is carried out. The aim of the article is to analyse and systematize the publications of scholars and practicing teachers of the period under study on the methods of teaching school subjects and calls for the use of positive foreign experience of that time. The research methodology involved the use of comparative analysis, systematization and theoretical generalization, bibliographic search. Instructions, manuals for the schedule of educational material, absolute control over each methodological step of the teacher, the number and topic of tasks as well as teaching time to present the material slowed down the progress in teaching methods development for the humanities and sciences in secondary schools throughout Ukraine. At the same time, teachers made attempts to make learning easier and more interesting, tried to introduce a humorous component into the learning process, had the opportunity to share methodological recommendations and learn about foreign methods in the pages of pedagogical journals. In the second half of the XIX – early XX centuries, the following tendencies were observed in the methodology of teaching school subjects in Ukraine: presentation of educational material from simpler to more complex, individual approach to students, use of associations between previously studied material and the new one, the use of visual aids in primary school.*

**Keywords:** teaching methods, school education, teaching, subject.

---

**Introduction.** The issue of choosing the best and most appropriate teaching methods in school education is especially relevant nowadays, as it was relevant at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The process of methodological search in the field of school education is continuous and presupposes the analysis of historical experience and modern requirements of society to the level of school education. Under such conditions, a retrospective study of methodological aspects of school education in Ukraine becomes especially significant for pedagogical science. Retrospective analysis of positive and negative consequences of using different methodological approaches in the field of school education helps to deepen the comprehension of the ideas presented by practising teachers and scholars and implement the most appropriate ones in the system of modern schooling.

The aim of the article is to analyse and systematize the publications of scientists and practicing teachers of the period under study on the methods of teaching school subjects and calls for the use of positive foreign experience of that time.

Methodological approaches to teaching the humanities and sciences in secondary schools of Ukraine in the second half of the XIX – early XX centuries are reflected in the works of prominent scholars and teachers of that time Gavryshchuk (1909), Mykolayevych (1901), Корач (1901), Климко (1905), Ярема (1912), Rudnytsky (1916), Pachovsky (1909).

**Methodology.** The research methodology involved the use of comparative analysis, systematization and theoretical generalization, bibliographic search.

**Results and Discussion.** The system methodological support of the educational process, an integral part of which is education content, is characterized by complexity and dynamism. The solution of the problem was facilitated by the activities of outstanding scholars and teachers whose works are still relevant today. The focus of the researchers was the personality of the teacher. The practical realization of educational content depended on the level of pedagogical culture and skills of the teacher.

Analysing the problem of burnout of gymnasium students, Lutetsky (1900) argued that the existing

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages for Sciences of the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

volume of high school courses could be successfully mastered even by the weakest students without much effort. The reason for students' burnout was due to the methods of teaching, the routine of teaching techniques, not the difficulty of the program (Лютецький, 1900: 30).

A scholar Friesendorf (1905) truly stated that it was not easy to draw up a detailed curriculum of new educational content and to implement it in practice. This required great art and knowledge of the teacher as well as a lot of work. From the university bench the teacher began to teach according to a ready-made template and textbooks, using methods he was taught (Фризендорф, 1905: 65-66).

An educator Zolotarev (1900) argued that due to the absence of clarity in learning and in scientifically sound courses in history, geography and science, the child's mind was confused in the chaos of definitions and terms that were not the result of living observation of objects and phenomena. The child became "walking terminology" interested in the meaning of a word, not the phenomena. In the process of teaching, the teacher needed to avoid everything abstract and generalized, not to curb the child's curiosity and provide ready-made definitions (Золотарев, 1900: 19). While studying the Law of God, History and Literature, it was necessary to acquaint students not with names, years and numbers, but with living people. The intentions, ideals and actions of these people should be explained to students according to their age. The school of the future should take care of mental, physical and moral development of students, the preparation for practical life, the formation of character. Secondary education should be based on the following principles: concentricity of learning, gradual transition from visual, concrete learning to scientific and abstract, gradual strengthening of specialization (Золотарев, 1900: 47-49).

Zalker's opinion (1893) in the article "Education, not scholarship" was absolutely correct. The scholar wrote: "The school must give a conscious and well-founded view of life and peace, must develop a natural mind, their own thinking and judgment. In the current teaching, the personal ability to think was killed rather than developed. Nowadays, young people learn at school not to reason, but only to learn" (Залькер, 1893: 25).

According to the scholar Kareev (1900), the program and instructions should not interfere with the personal initiative and personal opinion of the teacher. The textbook needed flexibility so that the teacher could easily change the order in which students read history, if this order seemed inconvenient to him / her. It was impossible not to allow the teacher to omit something in the textbook at his / her discretion, taking into account the program, the number of teaching hours, the level of class development and even individual students (Капеев, 1900: 76).

Schurat (1908) in the article "Humour at school" saw the reasons for the alienation of home from school, the student from the teacher not in uninteresting scientific material, "being overloaded" with studying, insufficient pedagogical talent of teachers, but in unfriendly and gloomy atmosphere in the classroom, i.e. in the absence of such an important pedagogical factor as humour. "Humour is a balm, it heals everything and never hurts, it does not repel, but attracts; does not tease, but disarms. When a subject is dry and uninteresting, the teaching hour should not be the same" (Щурат, 1908: 8-10).

The methodological recommendations for conducting classes at school included the following steps. In the beginning, the teacher should explain the same notion until he / her was convinced of the knowledge of his / her students. It was better to make slow progress and learn less, but thoroughly until the teacher was convinced that everything remains in student's memory. Everything that was not clear to the student, the teacher should try to explain clearly so that the student could talk about the subject himself / herself. To speak only in essence, not to tell the student everything that the teacher knew and not to demand from the student all the knowledge at once. To separate the more important part of the subject from the less important, repeat it until the student remembered a clear concept. Each subject must be divided into parts and levels, to process them logically and methodically, so that the student could answer the question himself / herself (Савицкий, 1901: 70).

Analysing "Methods in public school. Visual science" written by Gavryshchuk (1909) Mykolayevych (1901) came to the conclusion that the value of this book lied in the selection and logical ordering of the topics discussed. At the beginning of teaching, Mykolayevych (1901) did not advise to use drawings of those objects which children had no opportunity to see. He did not consider it appropriate to talk at this level about the lungs, guitar, piano, tram, ships. In "visual" science as well as in the later science of "reality", he recommended to use induction method (from specific subjects to general rules and concepts). Teaching inductively was necessary to describe a cock, a hen, a turkey, a duck, and then to give the general name, that was opposite to the material in the textbook (Миколаєвич, 1901: 285).

Of particular interest was teaching foreign languages. Kopach (1901) truly remarked that the most

effective learning of a foreign language could be carried out only by means of the rules a child learns his / her native language with astonishing speed – listening and imitating his / her elders (Копacz, 1901: 21).

Most foreign language teachers were foreigners and used natural method of teaching, which included the following “learn a foreign language as you learned your mother tongue” (Боцвадзе, 1905: 53). Proponents of natural method argued that it would help students not only speak but also think in a foreign language.

In practice, this method required that the teacher did not know or use the native language of the students, which was completely replaced by visual instruction. Teachers could not draw students' attention to the similarities and differences in all the grammars they studied. At school, children learned not to understand, but only to remember.

The famous French philosopher Albert Lemoine criticized natural method. In his opinion, when teaching a foreign language, only a method that allowed the use of the native language and was based on it could be called natural, so that the student could comprehensively and consciously perceive the unknown (Вейсманъ, 1890: 156).

The best teachers of all countries, starting with Comenius, held the view that when teaching foreign languages, the native language should be a mediator, without which the student cannot enter a completely unfamiliar to him / her foreign speech. The student needed the teacher to show the object and say its name in two languages at once. In this way, the word spoken in the native language served as an additional way of remembering its foreign counterpart (Вейсманъ, 1890: 158).

The use of natural method in teaching foreign languages required the student to forget for a while all his / her past, all that he studied, all the habits of thinking, feeling, expressing thoughts, and was unsuitable for explaining abstract concepts.

Whatever the teacher's view on the purpose of teaching new foreign languages, in practice lessons had always been reduced to learning words and poems, to “memorizing” grammar rules, to retelling long boring passages in the classroom (Фотъ, 1905: 173). Such lessons were lifeless for the students.

Klymko (1905) believed that when teaching a second regional language, the teacher's task was to ensure that children knew and wrote the language well after studying in a public school. In the beginning he advised to compose easy sentences, similar to the child's native language. In the lower grades, he recommended writing “transcripts” from a book or spreadsheet, short dictations, writing sentences from memory, and answers to several questions asked at school. It was better for students to write little but well and without mistakes than a lot, diligently and with mistakes. When reading, the teacher had to make sure that the words were pronounced correctly. Students could read the whole sentence so many times until the stress was correct everywhere. The teacher had to give students the opportunity to correct each other, and if no student could correct correctly, the correction was made by the teacher. It was believed that if a student could read well, he / she would also learn to speak well (Климко, 1905: 215-218).

Militsyna (1907) in her article “Problems of Teaching New Languages in Secondary School” focused on the opinion of the German professor Bendin that “it was more important for a student to speak whatsoever rather than speak correctly” (Милицина, 1907: 180). According to her, the purpose of learning the language in high school was to get acquainted with the modern people of the country whose language was studied. In this case, the study of foreign languages was as follows: the student read books of medium difficulty, mostly by modern authors; the student understood the spoken language; the student was able to express his / her thoughts in a simple form (Милицина, 1907: 180-181).

A famous scholar Yarema (1912) stated in the pages of Lviv magazine “Nasha Shkola” that the generally accepted method of memorizing words written in a foreign language was unacceptable from the standpoint of psychology. As a result of this study, foreign words were involuntarily associated with words of the native language, and such an association was one of the main obstacles in learning a foreign language. While trying to speak German, the student composed Ukrainian words into sentences and then replaced them with German ones. He believed that words of a foreign language should be presented without the help of the words of the native language and directly combined with the corresponding images of objects and phenomena. The teacher must mostly speak to students in a foreign language. Then the students will have the appropriate images, and the words will be combined with these images, not with Ukrainian words. The next step was to explain to the students the meaning of words with the help of objects, movements, not Ukrainian words. The scholar recommended that the teacher should explain the verbs by performing movements towards the students, which meant the following words *ich gehe voran, ich gehe ihm nach, ich gehe auf ihn los, ich trete auf ihn zu, ich weiche ihm aus*, etc. This made it possible to visualize a large number of foreign words without the use of the native language (Ярема, 1912: 17).

An educator Rudnytsky (1916) persuasively argued that if a student cannot fully understand the German text, he / she was overwhelmed by indifference, aversion to a difficult foreign language. In his opinion, the most important thing in learning a foreign language was its constant, continuous, daily use. Under such conditions, the child could get acquainted with a language he / she did not know at all, get used to it, and learn to manage that language on the basis of the simplest grammar rules and patterns. However, this technique involved daily classes. If a student was able to hear German every day, it lost its “inaccessibility”. The scholar believed that in two or three days a child forgets a lot and it was better to teach for half an hour every day than three times for an hour (Рудницький, 1916: 26-27).

By means of daily communication with a teacher who knew German fluently, students could gain a sense of language, learn to operate the language without knowing the basic grammar rules. The educator believed that using the Ukrainian language to learn German was possible only in the first half of the first semester of study, so that the child did not get used to the fact that German cannot be understood without the help of Ukrainian. He considered it inappropriate to make translations from the native language in the first and second grades, because they spoil the good impression of a foreign language. When translating, the student realized how difficult it was to translate from one language to another and considered the reason for the complexity the German language itself. According to the author, it was proper to use translation from the fourth grade, when the student could choose the most appropriate one from the known phrases to express the opinion presented in the native language. The scholar recommended in the third and fourth grades to spend one hour a week on individual reading of books in German, to pay more attention to the study of synonyms, various phrases that express a similar opinion. Due to the small number of hours, the teacher had to skip passages. (Рудницький, 1916: 29).

According to Pachovsky (1909), it was advisable to study grammar and reading at the same time. He recommended devoting 15 minutes an hour to the practical teaching of grammar on the examples of sentences from the textbook or composed by students from individual words provided by the teacher. (Пачовський, 1909: 53).

Describing the method of teaching reading in German, the author noted that according to the curriculum, only one student should read clearly and loudly so that other students, listening to him / her, could understand reading. In the process of reading, the student must acquire a sense of the beauty of language, the meaning of words, the richness of expressions and phrases (Пачовський, 1909: 53).

Methods of teaching Geography was based on the following principles:

- Students had to associate each geographical name with the location of that area on the map. A globe and a map were required in the teacher's explanations and students' answers. Students were required to imagine the relative position of the points they studied on the earth's surface. To do this, they used an exercise that involved an imaginary journey from one part of the world to another by land and water, showing all the known geographical features along the way.

- Drawings and schemes were encouraged to ensure clarity. Drawing maps at home was not allowed.

- Basic information about the next lesson was to be learned by the students in the class.

- After studying several parts of the world or countries, the teacher by means of questions forced students to group homogeneous information (Учебный планъ географіи Торнау, 1890: 189).

For Sokolov (1893), the comparative method was the most convenient in teaching geography at school. In his opinion, the teacher must find the optimal ratio of Geography with other disciplines in the curriculum by rationally limiting the teaching material; prefer thoroughness over chaos, avoiding mechanical memorization; carefully prepare for lessons, bringing together explanations, clarifying questions and lively repetition; constantly apply catechetical and for certain sections acroamatic methods of teaching (Соколовъ, 1893: 141-143).

Classroom reading should complement the course of Geography, especially for those sections that were studied superficially (ethnography, life and activities of peoples) and at the same time were the most interesting for children. The teacher should assign reading for 15–20 minutes, followed by a 10-minute check of the assimilation of the facts on which the reading was intended. Home reading could also help the geography course, but it was difficult to implement because Geography was not considered the main subject (Соколовъ, 1893: 207).

For students, excerpts from the history of textbooks were often a dead abstraction that could not be mastered by creative people, and the whole history was presented as a cemetery with scattered tombstones of famous people. In teaching History, the focus should be shifted from the textbooks and lectures on special conscious reading of sources and historical monographs that were thoroughly collected to present specific

things instead of abstract, general notions, deepening knowledge and promoting independent reflection while reducing memorization material (Dropiovsky, 1906: 40).

A scholar Gurevich (1884) recommended to finish the History course not by repeating material from the textbooks, but by clarifying the sequence of events in the history of each of the most important peoples and the internal connection of phenomena in this period. The result of such a course was the student's ability to convey in a coherent story the main moments of life of the prominent peoples, as well as the ability to trace all the main moments in the development of important phenomena, such as the main moments of the plebeian struggle with patricians. etc. In his opinion, the matriculation exam should be conducted not in the form of oral, quick, mechanical answers based on textbooks read quickly before the exam, but in the form of a detailed written answer to one of the historical topics, which served as a guarantee of understanding phenomena of historical life acquiring a stock of factual knowledge. With such a setting of a repetitive course, students would take out of school more desire to read independently on history and to continue to study (Гуревичь, 1884: 13-14).

When teaching Physics, it was necessary to slowly and carefully, by means of the simplest experiments, acquaint the student with certain groups of phenomena, derive from them stable laws of physics, identify the internal connection between all phenomena belonging to this group, and finally show the benefits of this physical knowledge in the household, industry and trade.

A teacher at the Crown Prince Rudolf Imperial Gymnasium in Brody Niewolak (1911) noted from his own practice that acquaintance with machines and factories was of great importance for teaching Physics. He recommended starting with the smallest, such as a knife workshop, and gradually moving to larger ones. He considered it expedient to visit large factories with high school students. Students may have a desire to manage such a factory, which in turn will have a positive effect on learning (Niewolak, 1911: 9).

When teaching Physics, the teacher followed the method of induction, as it was the easiest and most accessible for students. He also considered it possible to use the heuristic method, which contributed to the development of independent thinking of students. In some cases, he used visual materials (Niewolak, 1911: 12). Goldstein (1892) argued that the main task of teaching Physics in high school was to give young people the ability to research analytically and synthetically natural phenomena and to introduce experience as a means of thinking (Гольдштейнь, 1892: 107).

Until 1890, the descriptive method was used in the teaching sciences. The object studied was shown either in colourful drawings or in samples. Experiments were also performed to find out the meaning of a certain object. The descriptive method was replaced by inductive. However, the compulsion to observe under the supervision of a teacher with constant reference to the familiar order of observation by means of leading questions prevented students from independent observation and drawing conclusions (Лесгафтъ, 1892: 94-95).

At pedagogical courses (1899) in Oster, Chernihiv region, it was emphasized that students would be able to solve the most difficult problem in mathematics if they were previously thoroughly acquainted with simple problems, on the basis of which a complex problem was formed. When solving the most difficult problems, students could use either a successful form of writing down the numbers of the problem or the teacher's explanation of the problem using a diagram or other visual aids, or successful leading questions of the teacher. It was considered unacceptable to impose on children any way to solve the problem. Students had to use all the ways to solve the problem and find the easiest (Отчетъ о педагогическихъ курсахъ въ г. Острѣ, 1902: 32)

**Conclusion.** Instructions, manuals for the schedule of educational material, absolute control over each methodological step of the teacher, the number and topic of tasks as well as teaching time to present the material slowed down the progress in teaching methods development for the humanities and sciences in secondary schools throughout Ukraine. At the same time, teachers made attempts to make learning easier and more interesting, tried to introduce a humorous component into the learning process, had the opportunity to share methodological recommendations and learn about foreign methods in the pages of pedagogical journals. In the second half of the XIX – early XX centuries, the following tendencies were observed in the methodology of teaching school subjects in Ukraine: presentation of educational material from simpler to more complex, individual approach to students, use of associations between previously studied material and the new one, the use of visual aids in primary school. Summarizing the information on the methodological support of the educational process, it can be argued that the activities of theorists and practitioners outpaced the capabilities of educational institutions for their mass implementation. Dependence on other states negatively affected educational content, mitigated national characteristics, hindered the development of Ukrainian

pedagogy.

### References

- Botsvadze, L.G. (1905). Neyestestvennost' "yestestvennogo" metoda v dele obucheniya yazykam [The unnaturalness of the "natural" method in teaching languages]. *Vestnik vospitaniya – Bulletin of Education*, 5, 153-167 [in Russian].
- Dropiowski, T. (1906). *Nasza szkola srednia, krytyka jej podstaw i konieczność reform [Our high school, a critique of its foundations and the need for reform]*. Kraków [in Polish].
- Fot, M. (1905). O prepodavanii yazykov v shkole [About teaching languages at school]. *Vestnik vospitaniya – Bulletin of Education*, 5, 168-187 [in Russian].
- Frizendorf, T. (1905). O reforme prepodavaniya matematiki v srednikh uchebnykh zavedeniyakh [On the reform of teaching mathematics in secondary educational institutions]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveshcheniya – Journal of the Ministry of Public Education*, CCCLVII, 61-67 [in Russian].
- Gol'dshteyn, M. (1892). Zhelatel'naya postanovka prepodavaniya fiziki v nashikh srednikh uchebnykh zavedeniyakh [Desirable setting of teaching physics in our secondary educational institutions]. *Russkaya shkola – Russian school*, 2, 105-11, 3, 78-89 [in Russian].
- Gurevich, Ya. (1884). O postanovke kursa istorii v nashikh klassicheskikh gimnazyakh [About setting the course of history in our classical gymnasiums]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveshcheniya – Journal of the Ministry of Public Education*, 5, 1-17 [in Russian].
- Havryshchuk, M. (1909). *Metodyka nauky v narodnyy shkoli. Chast' II. Nauka navhlyadna [Teaching methods in public school. Part II. Teaching visually]*. Chernivtsi [in Ukrainian].
- Kareyev, N.I. (1900). *Zametki o prepodavanii istorii v sredney shkole [Notes on teaching history in secondary school]*. St. Petersburg [in Russian].
- Klymko, I. (1905). Pro deyaki polekshennya pry nautsyi druhooho krayevoho yazyka v shkolakh narodnykh [About some reliefs in teaching the second regional language in folk schools]. *Uchytel' – Teacher*, 1, 22-31 [in Ukrainian].
- Kopacz, J. (1901) *Reforma nauki języka łacińskiego rozpoczęta przez H. Perthess [The reform of learning Latin started by H. Perthess]* Tarnopol [in Polish].
- Lesgaft, P. (1892). K voprosu o prepodavanii yestestvennykh nauk v spetsial'nykh uchebnykh zavedeniyakh (stat'ya vtoraya) [On the issue of teaching natural sciences in special educational institutions (article two)]. *Russkaya shkola – Russian school*, 1, 96-108 [in Russian].
- Lytetskiy, A. (1900). *K voprosu o reforme sredney shkoly [To the question of the reform of the secondary school]*. Moskva [in Russian].
- Militsina, L. (1907). Zadachi prepodavaniya novykh yazykov v sredney shkole [Tasks of teaching new languages in secondary school]. *Vestnik vospitaniya – Bulletin of Education*, 4, 172-181 [in Russian].
- Mykolayevych, Ya. (1901). Otsinka. Metodyka v shkoli narodnyy. CH.II Nauka nahlyadna [Evaluation. Methods in primary school. Part II Teaching visually]. *Uchytel' – Teacher*, 18, 283-286 [in Ukrainian].
- Niewolak, F. (1911). Nauka fizyki w gimnazyum [Teaching physics in gymnasium] *Sprawozdanie C.K. Gimnazyum im. Rudolfa w Brodach za rok 1910/1911*, XXXIII, 1-24 [in Polish].
- Otchet o pedagogicheskikh kursakh v g. Ostre v 1899 godu [Report on pedagogical courses in the city of Oster in 1899]* (1900). Chernigov [in Russian].
- Pachovs'ky, M. (1909). O skil'ky mozhna vykorystaty naynovishyy plyn dlya nyimetskoyi movy pry nautsyi nashoho vykladovoho yazyka [How much you can use the latest plan for the German language in teaching the language of instruction]. *Nasha shkola – Our School*, 1-2, 51-61 [in Ukrainian].
- Rudnyts'ky, Yu. (1916). Deyaki zamitky do nauky nyimets'koyi movy v serednykh shkolakh Halychyny [Some notes on teaching the German language in secondary schools of Galicia]. *Nasha shkola – Our School*, 1-2, 51-61 [in Ukrainian].
- Savitskiy, I. (1901). Tema z konferentsyyi povitovoyi v Chernyivtsyakh 1900 r. [Topic from the regional conference in Chernivtsi in 1900]. *Uchytel' – Teacher*, 5, 70-73 [in Ukrainian].
- Shchurat, V. (1908). Humor u shkoly [Humor at school]. *Uchytel' – Teacher*, 1, 8-10 [in Ukrainian].
- Sokolov, A. (1893). Besedy o prepodavanii geografii v shkole [Conversations about teaching geography at school]. *Russkaya shkola – Russian school*, 2, 142-157; 7-8, 182-208 [in Russian].
- Uchebnyy plan geografii Tornau [Thornau Geography Curriculum] (1890). *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveshcheniya – Journal of the Ministry of Public Education*, CCLXXII, 189-198 [in Russian].
- Veysman, A. (1890). K voprosu o prepodavanii noveyshikh yazykov, frantsuzskago i nemetskago v

gimnaziyakh [On the issue of teaching new languages, French and German in gymnasiums]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveshcheniya – Journal of the Ministry of Public Education*, 5, 1-7 [in Russian].

Yarema, Ya. (1912). Na pedahohichnih temy [On pedagogical topics]. *Nasha shkola – Our School*, 4, 12-18 [in Ukrainian].

Zal'ker, G. (1893). Obrazovanie, a ne uchenost' [Education, not scholarship]. *Vestnik vospitaniya – Bulletin of Education*, 1, 22-31 [in Russian].

Zolotarev, S.A. (1900). *Golos sem'i o shkole [The voice of the family about the school]*. Riga [in Russian].

## Методичні аспекти удосконалення шкільної освіти в Україні (друга половина XIX – початок XX ст.)

**Вихрущ Наталія<sup>2</sup>**

*Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка, Львів, Україна*

Процес методологічного пошуку у царині шкільної освіти є безперервним і ґрунтується на аналізі історичного досвіду та сучасних вимогах суспільства до рівня шкільної освіти. За таких умов особливої значимості для педагогічної науки набуває ретроспективне дослідження методичних аспектів шкільної освіти в Україні. У статті узагальнено методичні підходи до викладання дисциплін гуманітарного та природничого циклів у середніх школах України другої половини XIX – початку XX ст. Проведено аналіз позитивних та негативних наслідків використання різних методичних підходів. Мета статті – аналіз та систематизація публікацій науковців та практикуючих вчителів досліджуваного періоду щодо методики викладання шкільних дисциплін та закликів використання тогочасного позитивного зарубіжного досвіду. Методологія дослідження передбачала використання порівняльного аналізу, систематизації та теоретичного узагальнення, бібліографічного пошуку. Інструкції, приписи розкладу навчального матеріалу, контроль над кожним методичним кроком вчителя, кількістю та тематикою завдань, навчальним часом для викладу матеріалу сповільнювали поступ у методиці викладання дисциплін гуманітарного та природничого циклів у середніх школах України. Водночас, вчителі робили спроби зробити навчання легшим та цікавішим, намагалися вводити еумористичну складову у процес навчання, мали змогу поділитися методичними рекомендаціями та дізнатися про зарубіжні методики на сторінках педагогічних часописів. У другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст. у методиці викладання шкільних дисциплін в Україні мали місце такі тенденції: виклад навчального матеріалу від простішого до складнішого, використання індивідуального підходу до учнів, використання асоціацій між раніше вивченим та новим матеріалом, послуговування наочними засобами у початковій школі.

**Ключові слова:** методи навчання, шкільна освіта, навчання, навчальний предмет.

### **Література**

Боцвадзе Л. Г. Неестественность «естественного» метода въ деле обучения языкамъ. *Вестникъ воспитанія*. 1905. № 5. С. 153-167.

Вейсманъ А. Къ вопросу о преподаваніи новейшихъ языковъ, французскаго и немецкаго въ гимназіяхъ. *Журналъ Министерства Народнаго Просвещенія*. 1890. № 5. С. 1-7.

Гавришук, М. Методика науки в народній школі. Часть II. Наука наглядна. Чернівці, 1909. 213 с.

Гольдштейнъ М. Желательная постановка преподаванія физики въ нашихъ среднихъ учебныхъ заведеніяхъ. *Русская школа*. 1892. № 2. С. 105-117.

Гуревичъ Я. О постановке курса исторіи в нашихъ классическихъ гимназіяхъ. *Журналъ Министерства Народнаго Просвещенія*. 1884. № 5. С. 1-17.

Залькеръ Г. Образование, а не ученость. *Вестникъ воспитанія*. 1893. № 1. С. 22-31.

Золотарев С. А. Голос семьи о школе. Рига, 1900. 60 с.

Кареев Н.И. Заметки о преподаваніи исторіи в средней школе. СПб, 1900. 90 с.

Климко І. Про деякі полекші при науці другого краєвого языка в школах народних. *Учитель*. 1905. № 13. С. 214-218.

Лесгафтъ П. Къ вопросу о преподаваніи естественныхъ наукъ въ специальныхъ учебныхъ заведеніяхъ (статья вторая). *Русская школа*. 1892. №1. С. 96-108.

Лютецій А. Къ вопросу о реформе средней школы. Москва, 1900. 95 с.

Миколаєвич Як. Оцінка. Методика в школі народній. Ч. II Наука наглядна. Написав Мик. Гавришук. Видане тов «Руська Школа», книжка 6. Чернівці 1901 стор 116+6 стор образків. *Учитель*. 1901. № 18.

<sup>2</sup> кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри іноземних мов для природничих факультетів Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка

С. 283-286.

Милицина Л. Задачи преподавания новых языков в средней школе *Вестникъ воспитания*. 1907. № 4. С. 172-181.

Отчет о педагогических курсах в г. Остре в 1899 году. Черниговъ, 1900. 64 с.

Пачовський М. О скільки можна використати найновіший плян для німецької мови при науці нашого викладового языка. *Наша школа*. 1909. № 1-2. С. 51-61.

Рудницький Ю. Деякі замітки до науки німецької мови в середних школах Галичини. *Наша школа*. 1916. № 7. С. 25-30.

Савіцкий І. Тема з конференції повітової в Чернівцях 1900 р. *Учитель*. 1901. № 5. С. 70-73.

Соколовъ А. Беседы о преподавании географии в школе. *Русская школа*. 1893. № 2. С. 142-157; №7-8. С. 182-208.

Учебный планъ географии Торнау. *Журнал Министерства Народнаго Просвещения*. 1890. ССLXXII. С. 189-198.

Фоть М. О преподавании языков в школе. *Вестникъ воспитания*. 1905. № 5. С. 168-187.

Фризендорфъ Т. О реформе преподавания математики в средних учебных заведениях. *Журнал Министерства Народнаго Просвещения*. 1905. ССCLVII. С. 61-67.

Щурат В. Гумор у школі. *Учитель*. 1908. № 1. С. 8-10.

Ярема Я. На педагогічні теми. *Наша школа*. 1912. № 4. С. 12-18.

Dropiowski T. Nasza szkoła średnia, krytyka jej podstaw i konieczność reformy. Kraków, 1906. 52 s.

Kopacz J. Reforma nauki języka łacińskiego rozpoczęta przez H. Perthess. Tarnopol, 1901. 33 s.

Niewolak F. Nauka fizyki w gimnazjum. *Sprawozdanie C.K. Gimnazjum im. Rudolfa w Brodach za rok 1910/1911*. 1911. XXXIII. S. 1-24.

Accepted: March 15, 2022

