

УДК 378.091.2(477)(09)“1850/1917”(043.3)

KEY APPROACHES OF THE LANGUAGE TEACHING: THEN AND NOW

Kan Olena, PhD student of prof. Ye. Petukhov Pedagogy, Psychology and Educational Management Department, Kherson State University.

ORCID: 0000-0002-3975-5385

E-mail: l-kan@ukr.net

The article deals with the analysis of key approaches used for language teaching in Ukrainian universities in 1850–1917 and at the present moment to apply those of them which were used for language learning at Ukrainian universities in 1850–1917. The most widespread method was the translation method. At present, alongside the traditional approach, the innovative approach is also used. The key method is communicative. It could be useful to apply a multidisciplinary for teaching foreign languages. The continuity was topical for academic instruction in 1850–1917 and it is still topical in the present.

Keywords: language teaching, approaches, methods, historical background, Ukrainian universities, continuity, multidisciplinary, communicative method.

ОСНОВНІ ПІДХОДИ ДО ВИКЛАДАННЯ МОВ: ІСТОРІЯ ТА СУЧАСНІСТЬ

Кан Олена, аспірантка кафедри педагогіки, психології й освітнього менеджменту імені проф. Є. Петухова, Херсонський державний університет.

ORCID: 0000-0002-3975-5385

E-mail: l-kan@ukr.net

Стаття присвячена аналізу ключових підходів, які використовувались для викладання мови в українських університетах у 1850–1917 роках та на сучасному етапі (2000–2019 роки) з метою модифікації та застосування тих з них, які застосовувались для вивчення мови в українських університетах у 1850–1917 роках. Період 1850–1917 років був насичений змінами та модифікаціями у підготовці філологів в українських університетах. Цей період характеризувався пошуком нових форм та методів навчання. Автор зазначає, що найпоширенішим методом у той період був метод перекладу з його варіаціями: перекладацько-граматичний та перекладацько-лексичний. У 1850–1917 роках відсутність універсального навчально-методичного забезпечення спричинило, з одного боку, неефективне викладання, оскільки рівень викладання повністю залежав від кваліфікації викладача, а з іншого боку – давало певну свободу під час викладання. Автор приходить до висновку, що сьогодні в українських університетах поряд із традиційним підходом використовується й інноваційний підхід. Він охоплює безліч методів, але ключовим є комунікативний. Комунікативний метод надав поштовх для розвитку сучасних методологій та прийомів навчання (предметно-інтегроване навчання, стиль Dogte, лексичний підхід тощо). Проведене дослідження дозволяє стверджувати, що застосування мультидисциплінарного підходу, який використовувався в 1850–1917 роках, може бути корисним під час викладання іноземних мов у сучасних закладах вищої освіти. Виявлено, що наступність була актуальною для навчального процесу в 1850–1917 роках і є актуальною сьогодні. Зроблено висновок, що передумови для деяких сучасних методів викладання в українських університетах мають історичне підґрунтя, а деякі з них потребують подальшого дослідження для ефективного застосування в навчальному процесі.

Ключові слова: викладання мов, підходи, методи, історичне минуле, українські університети, принцип наступності, мультидисциплінарність, комунікативний метод.

The philologists' training always ranked high in the society. Within the last century, there was some dramatic drop of interest in humanities and philology. But at the beginning of the XXI century, these fields of study have started to be of great importance again. The role of philological education has become an object for many research and the significance of the philological knowledge has been topical not only for humanities experts but for specialists in other fields as well. Professionals who have a philological education gained better skills in communication, public speaking, and making presentations, writing, and creativeness [15].

As to the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data, there were four humanities degrees which can help to get a job easier. They made research including 12 degrees which were the most competitive in 2014–2015. Humanities won four out of twelve. They were: history and philosophy, languages, law, education [17]. It means that currently, it could be topical to research methods and approaches used in these fields as well as to roll out the elements of the philological education in the curriculums of other fields of study to promote and facilitate interpersonal skills, further employment, and competitiveness.

The historical experience is essential for improving the present. Realizing mistakes of the past allows upgrading the current facets. Education always was and is an integral part of society. Historical and pedagogical sources contain information as to the content, forms, and methods of training in higher educational institutions that can be used in the modern educational process.

There are scientific works that are devoted to the retrospective analysis of the operation and work of higher educational institutions in Ukraine (XIX–XX century). They are of some high value for the research of different aspects of language teaching in Ukrainian universities of the mentioned above period. These works mostly include several theses of Ukrainian history and domestic history of pedagogy such as L. Berezivska, L. Vovk, H. Dodonova, L. Zelenska, V. Ivashchenko, H. Kosinova, L. Kurylo, I. Kurliak, M. Levkivskyi, O. Martynenko, O. Mykytiuk, I. Mozhova, M. Nosalevych, O. Osova, A. Pavko, O. Ptashnyi, N. Puzyriova, N. Seiko, N. Slyusarenko, T. Stoian, O. Sukhomlynska, O. Sypchenko, Yu. Fesko, S. Cherniak, M. Iarmachenko, etc.

Some historical and pedagogical aspects of philological education including classical philology in the system of higher education of Ukraine are researched by N. Balenko, L. Bunina, L. Vovk, L. Kurylo, M. Levkivskyi, A. Pavko, Yu. Shelest etc.

Some scientific works research and analyze aspects of language teaching as a component of future philologists training in Ukraine: O. Misechko, N. Borysova, N. Doronina, A. Kryshko, A. Puchkov, Yu. Shelest etc.

N. Doronina's work includes the complex study of the establishment and evolution of the philological subjects in the Imperial University of St. Volodymyr in 1834–1919. The researcher shows the introduction of the classical, Slavic, and Romance, and Germanic philology reveals the academic staff's work. The author researches the division of the philological studies into concentrations and courses. In her work, N. Doronina gives data about the academic staff of the linguistics departments paying attention to the historical background of the creation of Indo-European comparative grammar chair and Romance-Germanic philology chair in the historical-philological faculty of the Imperial University of St. Volodymyr. Her thesis completely covers the philologists' training in one of the leading universities in Ukraine. But it has a more historic than pedagogic nature because she studies the establishment and evolution of the philological subjects from the perspective of historic

events [2].

The results of Yu. Shelest's scientific work can also be useful for research. She researches the content of the training and organizational concepts for language learning in Ukrainian universities which were under the government of the Russia and Austrian Empire in XIX – at the beginning of the XX century. The author defines the main definitions of the research such as “university”, “foreign language”, “classical languages”, “new languages” etc. The researcher analyzed the content, forms, and methods of training of foreign languages and the specific features of the academic staff [12]. But Yu. Shelest doesn't cover language teaching at Chernivtsi University that was founded in 1875 and located within the modern territorial frontiers of Ukraine.

The complex and deep research by O. Misechko points out major trends of the step-by-step development of professional training for foreign language teachers. The scientific work deals with the initial formation of the neophilological education («new» languages) separately from classical philology, its content among other philological studies, its formation as an independent field not in connection with history as in classical studies. The author analyses some attempts to search for new forms and content of the teacher training which cover new practical orientation of teaching. O. Misechko describes the foundation of the first network of professional linguistic education, its evolution from 1900 up to 1964 [8].

The purpose of the article is to analyze key approaches used for language learning in Ukrainian universities in 1850–1917 and at the present moment (2000–2019) to modify and apply those of them which were used for language learning in Ukrainian universities in 1850–1917.

Among present-day teaching approaches, it is possible to define two big groups of approaches: traditional and innovative. There are a lot of definitions of the term “approach”. Some research says that the terms “approach” and “method” can be interchangeable. Others insist on two different meanings of these terms. Under an “approach” we mean a notion other than a “method”. Following the opinion of J. C. Richards and T. S. Rodgers, an approach refers to the general assumptions about what language is and about how learning a language occurs [18]. The traditional approach, as a rule, includes translation and direct methods. The translation method can be divided into grammar-translation and lexical-translation (textual-translation). The innovative approach is represented by the communicative method which is definitely a key one among methods in the innovative group. The communicative method has pushed the development of current methods and techniques such as content and language integrated learning (CLIL), Dogme style, lexical approach, etc.

The period of 1850–1917 was full of changes and modifications in the training of philologists in Ukrainian universities. It was marked by the search for new forms and teaching methods progressing, transforming, and changing both positively and negatively.

The future philologists' training in Ukrainian universities of the mentioned above period was made at Kyiv Imperial University of St. Volodymyr, Kharkiv Imperial University, Novorossiia Imperial University (Odesa), Chernivtsi University, Lviv University. The first three universities were under the government of the Russian Empire, Lviv University – under the Polish government, Chernivtsi University – Austrian-Hungarian. The different governments and the political system made some certain impact on organizational and methodical principles of the future philologists' training in all the above-mentioned universities having both common and different features.

To show organizational and methodical principles of the training for future philologists in Ukrainian universities in 1850–1917 we compare some aspects: the name of the faculty where philologists were trained, separate units or chairs which provided training, the language of teaching, forms of teaching applied and the availability of the courseware.

The organizational and methodical principles of the training for future philologists in Ukrainian universities in 1850–1917 are given in Table 1 [5].

As you can see from Table 1 at Kyiv Imperial University of St. Volodymyr, Kharkiv Imperial University, Novorossiya Imperial University (Odesa) there was a historical-philological faculty where philologists were trained but at Chernivtsi University and Lviv University, there was a philosophy faculty. At Kyiv Imperial University of St. Volodymyr, Kharkiv Imperial University, and Lviv University it was an almost simultaneous division into various specializations and it caused the creation of the separate chair of classical philology. At Chernivtsi University and Novorossiya Imperial University (Odesa), there was no such a division as they were founded later and they had the chair of classical philology from the very beginning of its establishment [5].

While philologists' training was a primary focus on the classical philology and classical languages, literature. There also were chairs of Slavic-Russian philology, and later Romance-Germanic languages, though the teaching of so-called new languages (English, German, French, etc.) was available in the curriculums of all universities [10].

As to the forms of teaching it could be said that they were almost similar at all universities of that period. There were six main forms for the teaching of philological subjects: lectures, practical lessons, seminars, colloquiums, rehearsals, interviews [9].

Among teaching methods, the translation method was a key one having such variations as grammar-translation and lexical-translation. As to the techniques which were used by teachers it is possible to point out the following: reading of the ancient authors with eliciting, practical language exercises, written reports, conversations between a teacher and a student, works' analyses, etc. [9].

None of the universities of the researched period had some universal courseware so each professor prepared his notes and tests or chose a textbook on his own. Thus the level of teaching completely depended on the professor's professional skills, his knowledge, and qualification. Textbooks and other materials were published in German or Latin so students had to know the language on a high level to able to learn the subject [7].

Table 1

The organisational and methodical principles of the future philologists' training in Ukrainian universities in 1850–1917

University name	Faculty	Units/chairs	Language of teaching	Forms of teaching	Methods	Courseware
St. Volodymyr Kyiv Imperial University	Historical-philological (since 1850)	Classical Slavic-Russian Romance-Germanic Languages studied: Latin, Greek, English, French, German, Italian, Polish	Russian, Latin	Lectures Practical lessons Seminars Colloquium Rehearsal Interview	Translation method with some forms: grammatical-translation and lexical-translation	Lack of universal courseware

Kharkiv Imperial University	Historical-philological (since 1850)	Classical Slavic-Russian Romance-Germanic Languages studied: Latin, Greek, English, French, German, Italian, Sanskrit	Russian, Latin	Lectures Practical lessons Seminars Colloquium Rehearsal Interview	Translation method with some forms: grammatical-translation and lexical-translation	Lack of universal courseware
Novorossiya Imperial University (Odesa)	Historical-philological (since 1850)	Classical Slavic-Russian Romance-Germanic Languages studied: Latin, Greek, English, French, German, Italian, Eastern languages (there was a chair of oriental studies)	Russian, Latin	Lectures Practical lessons Seminars Colloquium Rehearsal Interview	Translation method with some forms: grammatical-translation and lexical-translation	Lack of universal courseware
Lviv University	Philosophy	Classical Slavic-Russian Languages studied: Latin, Greek, French, German, Polish, Eastern languages, Ukrainian	German and Latin (some courses were taught in Polish and Latin)	Lectures Practical lessons Colloquium Rehearsal Interview Philological-historical seminar	Translation method with some forms: grammatical-translation and lexical-translation	Lack of universal courseware
Chernivtsi University	Philosophy	Classical Romanian Languages studied: Latin, Greek, French, German, Romanian	German, Romanian	Lectures Practical lessons Seminars Interview Workshops	Translation method with some forms: grammatical-translation and lexical-translation	Lack of universal courseware

Source: compiled by the author based on [5].

Thus the analysis of historical-pedagogical resources and archival materials allows us to conclude that the academic instructions for future philologists had similar features at Kyiv Imperial University of St. Volodymyr, Kharkiv Imperial University, Novorossiya Imperial University (Odesa) because these institutions were under the government of one country. Though Chernivtsi University and Lviv University were under the government of different countries at that time, they had almost the same organizational and methodical principles for future philologists' training. And it could be name natural as these two universities imitated academic instructions of European universities of that time.

As well as at Chernivtsi University and Lviv University, language teaching at Ukrainian universities under the Russian Empire government was based on the European academic traditions. The European system provided teaching methods for foreign language learning. All Ukrainian universities in 1850–1917 taught Latin and Greek as major foreign languages. As to the new languages, their teaching was dictated both by the demand among students and by the academic staff's availability. European foreign languages were not of

great significance up to the XX century. This was caused by the concentration of the curriculums on the classical languages especially Latin that had a status of lingua franca.

The same is now with English because there are approaches that consider English to be like an international language of communication. English as lingua franca is defined functionally by its use in intercultural communication rather than formally by its reference to native-speaker norms whereas English as a second or foreign language aims at meeting native-speaker norms and gives prominence to native speaker cultural aspects [13].

Language teaching was mainly done in a deductive way which provided language learning by translating and memorizing. Forms of teaching did not vary a lot and included reading, repetition, drilling, translating. Teachers used the following techniques: verbal, descriptive/visual, practical (eliciting texts from the textbooks which were available, translating from one language to another as usual from a foreign language into Russian, reading of foreign texts with commenting in a foreign or a native language, independent work which included reports mainly, individual doing of exercise, learning texts by heart, etc.) [4].

If we analyze approaches, methods, techniques which were used for language teaching in 1850–1917 we can conclude that language teaching was not efficient. Despite a large number of credits for language teaching students could not reach some high level even in such classical languages like Latin and Greek though they studied these languages in the secondary educational institutions as well. The monotony of teaching, the absence of multiformity caused low results. The lack of universal courseware, curriculums, and modules disabled proper academic performance ratings. The lack of universal courseware, curriculums, and modules can be considered both a negative and a positive feature. The positive trait is that the lack of universal courseware, curriculums gave a free hand to teachers during their lessons. If a teacher was a professional and he had some experience in language teaching then he can easily use different methods and techniques achieving high results.

In modern academic instruction, there is a similar method of teaching (in some manner) which is called Dogme. This method was invented by S. Thornberry in 2009. The essence of this method is that a teacher does not follow any certain curriculum or textbook using available teaching material [4]. Certainly, this method was not used completely while teaching languages in 1850–1917 but there is some certain similarity though the author of this method says that he was inspired by the idea of Dutch film-makers who promoted film-making without using needless technologies or editing [17; 20].

Another example of a connection between traditional and innovative approaches to language teaching is the immersion method. In 1850–1917 at classical universities major languages to learn were classical languages that are Latin and Greece. They were taught in all years and in all specialties. The special thing was that language teaching of Latin and Greek was not limited by grammar and vocabulary but covering cross-cultural aspects. Students not only read and analyzed works in the original but were aware of the history, culture, political events that surrounded the author's life and work creation.

The core subjects for students of the classical chair were the following: Introduction to Classical Philology (3 hours a week), History of Greek Literature: Epos, Lyrics, Drama (3 hours a week), History of Greek Literature: Prose of V, VI century (3 hours a week), History of Roman Literature (4 hours a week), Latin Grammar (4 hours a week), Greek and Latin Syntaxes (4 hours a week), Greek State Law (4 hours a week), Roman State Law (4 hours a week), Greek Antiquities (2 hours a week), Roman Antiquities (2 hours a week),

Athens Topography (1 hour a week), Rome Topography (1 hour a week), Greek Mythology (2 hours a week), Scansion (2 hours a week), Greek Graphic Arts (1 hour a week), Interpretation of Greek Author (4 hours a week), Interpretation of Roman Author (4 hours a week), Greek and Roman Epigraphy (4 hours a week), Historical Geography of Ancient World (2 hours a week) [9].

As it is seen these courses covered a lot of aspects of linguistics, cross-culture studies, history, and all of them were taught in a foreign language. Comparing such language multidisciplinary with current teaching methods it is possible to emphasize some common features with the immersion method and content and language integrated learning. CLIL, as it is said by the researchers, is based on the methodical principles of language immersion [16]. This method is used when students study different courses in a foreign language. It provides knowledge that is necessary for the process of professional communication making them use the language in the real environment and not to learn abstract themes [13]. But CLIL is aimed at efficient communication skills that could not be said about the grammar-translation method used for language learning in 1850–1917.

CLIL is one of the leading methods of language learning now. A lot of educational institutions are launching this method in the academic instruction that gives a possibility to learn professional terminology, to immerse into the professional environment. One of the main barriers to launching this method or bilingual learning in Ukraine is the lack of academic staff that has two higher educations – discipline-specific and linguistic though the elements of the CLIL approach are actively used by teachers, in particular, at technical and other non-linguistic universities.

It is also important to point out the continuity as a feature that took place in the educational system. As usual, the researchers speak about the continuity between secondary and higher education. N. Kriajeva in her research highlighted that during the XIX century there was an adaptation of traditional approaches to requirements of different fields of study caused by diversification of the educational institutions and their number [6].

O. Hetmanska as well tells about the continuity of philological (literature) education in the second half of the XIX – the beginning of the XX century. The researcher proves that the results of the analyses of the continuity of the education during the second half of the XIX – the beginning of the XX century can lead to the conclusion that after completing the regulatory stage (1804–1835) the process of the consecutive literature learning obtains methodological, conceptual nature. It emphasizes by creating innovative curriculums, textbooks, methodical continuity concepts, by structuring transitional (from the secondary to higher) practical forms of teaching. All mentioned above factors allow denoting 1835–1917 as a methodological stage of the continuity evolution from secondary to higher education [1].

Several researchers have studied the continuity principle in different countries of the world on various training levels. All of them consider continuity as a necessary principle in education. As it has been demonstrated globally there are some challenges between approved requirements for forming a foreign language communicative competence and the number of credits. The low common reference level of school leavers does not provide continuity in achieving the necessary level at secondary and higher education. It is possible to highlight several problems which appear because of the absence or low level of the continuity in the academic instruction in Ukraine: 1) some courses duplicate each other at school and university; 2) the training in the primary, secondary and high school is not coordinated according to the single principle; they have different structures, background and the

philosophy of teaching and learning; 3) the training in the secondary schools does not provide necessary qualification for majors in higher educational establishments (the absence or lack of subject-oriented instruction); 4) academic programs and standards are not adjusted with university entrance requirements for some specialities (e.g. creative competition); 5) at secondary schools there is a lack of methods, techniques which provide the formation of independent learning skills, self-organisation, self-analysis, individual research activity which are necessary for efficient learning in a higher educational establishment.

In conclusion, it is possible to say that language teaching at Ukrainian universities in 1850–1917 did not differ from general trends in language teaching of that time in Europe. The most widespread method was the translation method with its variations: grammar-translation and lexical-translation. At that period the lack of universal courseware caused, on the one hand, inefficient teaching because the level of teaching completely depended on the qualification of the teacher but on the other hand it gave some certain freedom while teaching. Unfortunately a large number of credits that were given for classical language teaching – Greek and Latin – were used inefficiently because methods, forms, and techniques of teaching were uniform and were not aimed at students' skills development.

The author also concludes that at present at Ukrainian universities alongside the traditional approach the innovative approach is also used. It covers a lot of methods but the key one is communicative. The communicative method has pushed the development of the current teaching methodologies and techniques. They are the following: content and language integrated learning, Dogme method, lexical approach, etc. In some methods and techniques used in 1850–1917, we can find some certain similarities or common features with the current trends in foreign language teaching (e.g. CLIL, language immersion, Dogme, etc.). So it is possible to say that the background for some modern teaching methods at Ukrainian universities is taken from the experience but some of them are still necessary to investigate for further potential application in the educational process.

The research done allows emphasizing that it could be useful to apply multidisciplinary while teaching foreign languages which was used in 1850–1917. At that time the list of the courses studied while learning a foreign language covered many aspects of different sciences that could facilitate the training for future philologists. Nowadays teaching various subjects in foreign languages is currently used in language teaching practice in Ukrainian educational institutions. But unfortunately, the launching of one of the most popular and leading trends – the CLIL method – into the academic instruction of higher education in Ukraine is complicated by the lack of the academic staff for teaching professional subjects in a foreign language, though the elements of the CLIL approach are actively used by teachers, in particular, at technical and other non-linguistic universities.

It is revealed that the continuity was topical for the academic instruction in 1850–1917 that is proved by some research and it is still topical in the present. The implementation of the continuity into teaching at Ukrainian universities is complicated by certain factors: the absence of consensus between levels of education, the lack of coordination between curriculums, unreadiness of future students to independent work in higher educational institutions, doubling of courses, etc.

The search for the most efficient ways of solving all mentioned above problems (for example by researching the teaching and academic instruction in Ukrainian universities in 1850–1917 and its further implementation in the modern educational process) is a direction for future research.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Гетманская Е. В. Преемственность литературного образования: закономерности методической традиции (конец XVII начало XX в.). *Теория и практика общественного развития*. 2013. № 2. С. 103–106.
2. Дороніна Н. В. Історія становлення та розвитку філологічних дисциплін в Імператорському університеті Св. Володимира (1834–1919 рр.): автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01. Київ, 2016. 18 с.
3. Известия о деятельности и состоянии наших учебных заведений. *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения*. 1871. № 2. С. 184–185.
4. Кан О. Ю. Іноземні мови як складова змісту освіти українських університетів II половини XIX – початку XX століття. *Педагогічний альманах: збірник наукових праць*. Херсон: КВНЗ «Херсонська академія неперервної освіти», 2015. Вип. 28. С. 264–271.
5. Кан О. Ю. Порівняльна характеристика організаційно-методичних засад підготовки майбутніх філологів в університетах України у 1850–1971 роках. *Сучасні тенденції та фактори розвитку педагогічних та психологічних наук: матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції* (Київ, 1–2 лютого 2019 року). Київ: ГО «Київська наукова організація педагогіки та психології», 2019. Ч. 1. С. 9–13.
6. Краева Н. Метода академика Я. К. Грота в учебных пособиях по иностранным языкам конца XIX века. *Труды института русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова*. 2014. Т. 2. С. 56–77.
7. Курило Л. Розробка та впровадження у педагогічному процесі класичних університетів України практичних занять (XIX – початок XX ст.). *Історико-педагогічний альманах*. 2014. Вип. 1. С. 84–89.
8. Місечко О. Є. Формування системи професійної підготовки вчителя іноземної мови у педагогічних навчальних закладах України (1900–1964 рр.): автореф. дис. ... д-ра пед. наук: 13.00.04. Київ, 2011. 43 с.
9. Обзорение преподавания наук и искусств в Императорском университете Св. Владимира во втором полугодие 1858–59 учебного года. Киев, 1859. 30 с.
10. Общий устав императорских российских университетов (18 июня 1863). *Сборник постановлений по Министерству Народного Просвещения*. СПб., Т. 3. С. 1040–1106.
11. Общий Устав императорских российских университетов 1864 года. Харьков, 1911. 59 с.
12. Шелест Ю. М. Вивчення іноземних мов в університетах України (XIX – початок XX століття): автореф. дис. ... канд. пед. наук: 13.00.01. Житомир, 2014. 20 с.
13. Commission of the European Communities Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004–2006. URL: <https://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2003:0449:FIN:EN:PDF> (Last accessed 26 December 2019).
14. Hülbauer C. Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural communication. *Synergies Europe*. 2008. No. 3. P. 27–28.
15. Humanities: Understand the classics for success in the modern world. URL: <https://www.studyinternational.com/news/humanities-understand-classics-success-modern-world> (Last accessed 23 Dec 2019).
16. Marsh D. Content and Language Integrated Learning: The European Dimension – Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential. *American Journal of Educational Research*. 2015. No. 3. P. 418–426.
17. Meddings L., Thornbury S. Teaching unplugged: Dogme in English language teaching. Delta publishing, 2009. 104 p.
18. Radburn Ch. Graduate jobs: top 12 degree subjects for getting a job URL: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/0/graduate-jobs-top-12-degree-subjects-getting-job> (Last accessed 23 Dec 2019).
19. Richards J. C., Rodgers T. S. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press, 2001. 90 p.
20. Thornbury S. A Dogma for EFL. *IATEFL*. 2000. Issue 2. P. 153–155.

REFERENCES

1. Getmanskaja, E. V. (2013). Preemstvennost literaturnogo obrazovanija: zakonomernosti metodicheskoi tradicii (konec XVII – nachalo XX v.). *Teorija i praktika obshhestvennogo razvitija*, (3), 103–106 [in Russian].
2. Doronina, N. V. (2016). Istoriya stanovlennya ta rozvytku filologichnykh dyscyplin v Imperatorskomu universyteti Sv. Volodymyra (1834–1919 rr.). *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].

3. Izvestija o dejatelnosti i sostojanii nashih uchebnyh zavedenij. (1871). *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshhenija*, (2), 184–185 [in Russian].
4. Kan, O. Yu. (2015). Inozemni movyyak skladova zmistu osvity ukrayinskykh universytetiv II polovyny XIX – pochatku XX stolittya. *Pedagogichniy almanax: zbirnyk naukovykh pracz*, 28, 264–271 [in Ukrainian].
5. Kan, O. Yu. (2019). Porivnyalna kharakterystyka organizacijno-metodychnykh zasad pidgotovky majbutnikh filologiv v universytetakh Ukrayiny u 1850–1971 rokax. *Suchasni tendenciyi ta faktory rozvytku pedagogichnykh ta psykholoichnykh nauk: proceedings of the Scientific and Practical Conference*. Kyiv: GO “Kyivska naukova organizaciya pedagogiky ta psykholoigiyi”, 1, 9–13 [in Ukrainian].
6. Kraeva, N. (2014). Metoda akademika Ja. K. Grota v uchebnyh posobijah po inostrannym jazykam konca XIX veka. *Trudy instituta russkogo jazyka im. V. V. Vinogradova*, 2, 56–77 [in Russian].
7. Kurylo, L. (2014). Rozrobka ta vprovadzhennya u pedagogichnomu procesi klasychnykh universytetiv Ukrayiny praktychnykh zanyat (XIX – pochatok XX st.). *Rozrobka ta vprovadzhennya u pedagogichnomu procesi klasychnykh universytetiv Ukrayiny praktychnykh zanyat (XIX – pochatok XX st.)*, 1, 84–89 [in Ukrainian].
8. Misechko, O. Ye. (2014). Formuvannya systemy profesijnoyi pidgotovky vchytelya inozemnoyi movy u pedagogichnykh navchalnykh zakladax Ukrayiny (1900–1964 rr.). *Extended abstract of doctor's thesis*. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
9. *Obozrenie prepodavaniya nauk i iskusstv v Imperatorskom universitete Sv. Vladimira vo vtorom polugodie 1858–59 uchebnogo goda* (1859). Kyiv [in Russian].
10. Obshhij ustav imperatorskih rossijskih universitetov (18 ijunja 1863). (1863). *Sbornik postanovlenij po Ministerstvu Narodnogo Prosveshhenija*, 3, 1040–1106 [in Russian].
11. *Obshhij Ustav imperatorskih rossijskih universitetov 1884 goda*. (1911). Kharkov [in Russian].
12. Shelest, Yu. M. (2014). Vyvchennya inozemnykh mov v universytetakh Ukrayiny (XIX – pochatok XX stolittya). *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Zhytomyr [in Ukrainian].
13. Commission of the European Communities Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004–2006. (2004). URL: <https://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2003:0449:FIN:EN:PDF>
14. Hülmbauer, C. (2008). Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural communication. *Synergies Europe*, 3, 27–28.
15. Humanities: Understand the classics for success in the modern world. (2017, October 18). URL: <https://www.studyinternational.com/news/humanities-understand-classics-success-modern-world>
16. Marsh, D. (2015). Content and Language Integrated Learning: The European Dimension – Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 3, 418–426.
17. Meddings, L. & Thornbery, L. (2009). *Teaching unplugged: dogme in english language teaching*. Delta publishing
18. Radburn, Ch. (2020, August 14). The top 12 degree subjects for getting a job. *The Telegraph*. URL: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/0/graduate-jobs-top-12-degree-subjects-getting-job>
19. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2015). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge (Inglaterra) Cambridge University Press.
20. Thornbury, S. (2000). A Dogma for EFL. *IATEFL. Issue 2*, 153–155.