

ISSN 3083-5682 (Print)
ISSN 3083-5690 (Online)

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ

НАУКОВИЙ ЧАСОПИС

УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ДЕРЖАВНОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ
ІМЕНІ МИХАЙЛА ДРАГОМАНОВА



Серія 5

Педагогічні науки:
реалії та перспективи

Випуск 109



Видавничий дім
«Гельветика»
2026

УДК 37.013(006)
НЗ4

ФАХОВЕ ВИДАННЯ

затвержене наказом Міністерства освіти і науки України № 886

від 02.07.2020 р. (додаток 4) (A1 Освітні науки; A2 Дошкільна освіта; A3 Початкова освіта; A4 Середня освіта (за предметними спеціальностями); A5 Професійна освіта (за спеціалізаціями); A6 Спеціальна освіта (за спеціалізаціями);
II0 Соціальна робота та консультування; III Дитячі та молодіжні служби)

Періодичність – 6 разів на рік

Засновник – Український державний університет імені Михайла Драгоманова

Рік заснування – 2004

У зв'язку зі зміною назви журналу було внесено відповідні зміни до Переліку наукових фахових видань України (Наказ Міністерства освіти та науки України № 1543 від 20.12.2023 р. (додаток 8))

Національна рада України з питань телебачення і радіомовлення

Витяг з реєстру суб'єктів у сфері медіа-ресторантів Ідентифікатор медіа R30-01411 (рішення № 932 від 28.09.2023 р.)

Суб'єкт у сфері друкованих медіа: Український державний університет імені Михайла Драгоманова (Код ЄДРПОУ 44807628, вул. Пирогова, 9, м. Київ, 01601, rector@udu.edu.ua, тел. (044) 234-11-08). ROR: <https://ror.org/00bat813>.

Мова видання: українська, англійська, іспанська, італійська, німецька, польська, словацька, угорська, французька, чеська

Науковий журнал включений до міжнародної наукометричної бази
Index Copernicus International (Республіка Польща)

Офіційний сайт видання: www.chasopys.ps.npu.kiev.ua

Схвалено рішенням Вченої ради УДУ імені Михайла Драгоманова
(протокол № 11 від 30 квітня 2026 року)

Редакційна колегія:

Андрущенко В. П. – доктор філософських наук, професор, академік НАПН України (голова редакційної ради);
Торбін Г. М. – доктор фізико-математичних наук, професор (заступник голови редакційної ради); *Вернидуб Р. М.* – доктор філософських наук, професор; *Драпушко Р. Г.* – кандидат філософських наук, професор; *Сєтух В. Б.* – доктор історичних наук, професор, член-кореспондент НАН України; *Корець М. С.* – доктор педагогічних наук, професор; *Лавриненко В. Г.* – кандидат історичних наук, професор; *Мацько Л. І.* – доктор філологічних наук, професор, академік НАПН України; *Панченко Л. М.* – кандидат філософських наук, професор; *Шут М. І.* – доктор фізико-математичних наук, професор, академік НАПН України.

Головний редактор серії:

Слабо В. М. – доктор педагогічних наук, професор, професор кафедри педагогіки Українського державного університету імені Михайла Драгоманова.

Редакційна колегія серії:

Гевко І. В. – доктор педагогічних наук, професор, проректор з навчально-методичної роботи, Тернопільський державний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка; *Яновський Конрад* – доктор психологічних наук, професор, ректор, Економіко-гуманітарний університет у Варшаві, Польща; *Рубене Занда* – докторка педагогічних наук, професор, проректорка Латвійського університету, професорка факультету освіти, психології та мистецтва, Латвійський університет, Латвія; *Кононенко А. Г.* – кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, директор Дунайського фахового коледжу Національного університету «Одеська морська академія»; *Савенкова Л. В.* – кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, директор Наукової бібліотеки Українського державного університету імені Михайла Драгоманова; *Смирнова І. М.* – доктор педагогічних наук, заступник директора з науково-педагогічної роботи Дунайського інституту Національного університету «Одеська морська академія»; *Хижна О. П.* – доктор педагогічних наук, професор кафедри музичного мистецтва Мукачівського державного університету; *Чумак М. С.* – доктор педагогічних наук, професор кафедри інформаційних технологій і програмування Українського державного університету імені Михайла Драгоманова; *Марченко В. В.* – доктор філософії, професор, ректор Національної академії керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв; *Потанчук О. І.* – доктор педагогічних наук, професор кафедри комп'ютерних технологій, Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка; *Биковський Т. В.* – кандидат педагогічних наук, професор, доцент кафедри професійної освіти Українського державного університету імені Михайла Драгоманова; *Макаренко Л. Л.* – доктор педагогічних наук, професор кафедри інформаційних систем і технологій, Український державний університет імені Михайла Драгоманова; *Затті Альберто* – доцент кафедри гуманітарних та соціальних наук, Університет Бергамо, Італія; *Шафранська Каріна* – доктор наук, професор Академії Виміру Справедливості, Академія прикладних наук (AWS) у Варшаві, Польща.

НАУКОВИЙ ЧАСОПИС УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ДЕРЖАВНОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ ІМЕНІ
НЗ4 **МИХАЙЛА ДРАГОМАНОВА. Серія 5. Педагогічні науки: реалії та перспективи.** Збірник наукових праць / М-во освіти і науки України, Укр. держ. ун-т імені Михайла Драгоманова. – Випуск 109. – Київ : Видавничий дім «Гельветика», 2026. – 262 с.

УДК 37.013(006)

У статтях розглядаються результати теоретичних досліджень та експериментальної роботи з питань педагогічної науки; розкрито педагогічні, психологічні та соціальні аспекти, які зумовлюють актуалізацію поставленої проблеми й допоможуть її вирішувати на сучасному етапі розвитку освіти.

Статті у виданні перевірени на наявність плагіату за допомогою програмного забезпечення StrikePlagiarism.com від польської компанії Plagiat.pl.

ISSN 3083-5682 (Print)
ISSN 3083-5690 (Online)

© Автори статей, 2026

© Редакційна рада і редакційна колегія серії, 2026

UDK 37.013.74

DOI <https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series5.2026.109.02>

Anani S., Tsykina D.

MANAGING THE QUALITY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSES

The article discusses aspects of management the quality in foreign language classes. It emphasizes that the quality of foreign language teaching is a key factor in successful language and intercultural education and is the result of the interaction of cognitive, affective, and social components. The main theoretical and empirical characteristics of quality foreign language classes are summarized.

The factors that determine the quality of foreign language classes include meaningful communication and the use of various social forms of work. Students participate in planning and evaluating lessons, summarizing the stages of learning in their own words during discussions, asking critical and additional questions, linking what they have already learned with new material, using their own knowledge, and thus transferring knowledge. Social forms (individual, partner, and group work) vary as much as the basic forms of learning. The variety of methods should remain consistent with the objectives and content.

The repertoire of methods for evaluating a teacher's work has been analyzed in detail: teacher self-assessment of lessons using a reflection journal, recording on information carriers; student feedback in the form of short comments (flash feedback, traffic light feedback, the "Aquarium" method), impulse questions, (standardized) questionnaires, observation questionnaires, targeted interviews and conversations, assessment of modular work; feedback from colleagues on recordings on information carriers and their discussion, internships, targeted interviews and conversations.

Examples of student surveys on the quality of foreign language as an academic discipline are given, and common and distinctive features are analyzed.

Key words: foreign language classes, student, surveys, quality management.

(стаття подана мовою оригіналу)

Currently, the priority areas for the development of Ukrainian higher economic education are as follows: horizontal/vertical integration; internationalization based on the Bologna principles; further provision of multi-level education; implementation of educational standards based on a competency-based approach; development of quality assessment systems for educational services; development of a knowledge assessment rating system; innovative component of education; lifelong learning. The Bologna Declaration on Higher Education was a fundamental step in the implementation of the quality management concept. The Bologna Process has become a priority in the reorganization of the domestic higher education system in accordance with the principles of creating a single international educational space. Educational institutions have begun to actively develop and implement quality management systems. Quality management systems help universities create special conditions for improving the effectiveness of education and increasing the satisfaction of consumers of educational services, which include students, potential employers, and society as a whole. However, until now, quality management in higher education institutions has mainly consisted of the administration of educational activities, without taking into account the specific features of teaching particular disciplines. Thus, the goal of the article is to conduct a detailed analysis of the theoretical and empirical characteristics of quality foreign language classes. The quality of foreign language teaching is a key factor in successful professional economic education. Current foreign language teaching methodology emphasizes that good teaching quality results from the interplay of cognitive, affective, and social components. The article summarizes the key theoretical and empirically based characteristics of foreign language teaching.

Good lesson design is based on clear learning objectives and transparent competence development. In line with the Common European Framework of Reference (Common European Framework of Reference for Language skills, 2020), learning objectives should promote linguistic competence in real communication situations. Transparency about performance requirements and learning progress increases learners' self-regulation (Hattie, 2013). The conditions under which teaching is successful have often been studied and attempts made to describe them. Hilpert Meyer has summarized the multitude of possible approaches. They focus on the development of skills and the learning success of learners. In his view, the first two aspects are particularly important for improving the quality of teaching.

The most important point is to clearly structure the teaching and learning processes: The common thread running through the lesson can be established by clearly defining the roles of teachers and students, by carefully preparing lessons and providing learning materials, by systematically structuring lesson content and successive teaching steps, by setting transparent tasks, using understandable verbal formulations, clear body language, and conscious proxemics. Didactically, this is supported by informative lesson introductions, by building on familiar knowledge, and by binding agreements on rules and rituals.

Intensive use of learning time refers to the time during which students are actively engaged in the subject matter and work purposefully on assigned tasks. This can be achieved if lessons start on time, organizational tasks are taken out of the classroom, the teacher responds to disruptions discreetly but systematically and purposefully, and the time arrangements for students are transparent and binding.

It is equally important to create a learning environment that is conducive to learning. This involves not only an attitude to work that is focused on the tasks to be accomplished in class, but also basic attitudes of politeness,

respect, and fairness, as well as responsible treatment of people and objects. If students experience the lessons as positive, a satisfied and cheerful atmosphere is more likely to develop, in which interests also grow. Teachers can contribute to this through an authentic attitude and by setting goals that involve the students.

To achieve this, it is necessary that the tasks are understandable, the teacher's approach appears plausible, and the results are systematically and reliably recorded. The lessons also need to have a balance of objectives, content, and methods. Careful didactic analysis creates a rhythmic sequence, and methods are tested for their suitability and didactic function.

Meaningful communication also contributes to the quality of foreign language teaching (Walsh, 2011). Students are involved in planning and providing feedback on lessons. In classroom discussions that are not solely teacher-centered, students repeatedly summarize the learning steps in their own words, ask critical and follow-up questions, build on what they have already learned, contribute their own knowledge, and are thus able to make a transfer. It is helpful for students to be trained in different forms of conversation, such as teaching conversations, questioning and developing conversations, discussions, or exam conversations, and for the individual forms to be clearly separated from one another in class.

The social forms (individual, partner, group work) are varied, as are the basic forms of teaching. The variety of methods must remain in proportion to the goals and content, and should not be pursued for its own sake.

Individual support and differentiation at the foreign language lessons (Vygotskij, 1978; Leisen, 2001) are not limited to diagnosing students' learning levels and differentiating teaching internally; above all, it refers to an attitude toward students that is expressed in patience, time set aside for learning, and freedom. It is beneficial for students to be taught support strategies: repetition and memorization, self-monitoring, approaching difficult or unfamiliar content, structuring and cross-linking material. Practice is seen as a central element of learning. Success is increased when students are able to attach meaning to the subject matter, when practice methods are varied, when attention is paid to rhythm, and when meaningful intervals are aimed for.

Another aspect would be transparent performance expectations, which must be formulated in a friendly but clear manner. In addition to the learning objectives, the type of tasks, the level of difficulty, and the methods must also be known and therefore practicable. Teachers can provide this to students through systematic performance feedback (exams, discussions, learning development reports), and self-monitoring and self-assessment by students, e.g., via portfolios, is becoming increasingly important.

Prepared learning environment (Hattie, 2013): This is achieved when the facility is functional and well organized. The necessary and useful teaching and learning materials are also provided. Students can identify with their learning environment by perceiving it as their "property" and designing it.

Evaluation through student feedback makes it possible to learn about and understand perspectives on learning processes. Differences in perspectives and experiences can thus be incorporated in a productive manner. This gives students the impression of reciprocity and the opportunity to participate in shaping the process. A prerequisite for this is that students see how the results are published transparently and how consequences are drawn from the results (drafting of goals, defining steps for action). Evaluation is thus the starting point for discussions about teaching, the group, and teacher-student interaction. The teacher's (objective) assessments also belong in the dialogue. One observed result of consistent student feedback is that the assessment of teaching practice is becoming less generalized and more differentiated. Therefore, teachers and students must agree in advance that evaluation as a form of feedback will follow the rules for feedback. Feedback should also be given promptly after a behavior has occurred, described using a specific example, name positive aspects, and include feasible suggestions for change. The person giving feedback should speak about themselves ("I found...", "I liked...") and express themselves in such a way that the statement could be said to them in the same way (reversibility). Let us now consider the repertoire of methods for teacher self-evaluation. A prerequisite for teacher self-evaluation is an appropriate repertoire of methods: Teacher self-evaluation via the assessment of lessons or teaching days by keeping a reflection journal, media recordings; student feedback through short feedback (flashlight, traffic light feedback, fishbowl), prompt questions, (standardized) questionnaires, observation sheets, targeted interviews and discussions, evaluation of module work; feedback from colleagues via media recordings and their discussion, classroom observations, targeted interviews and discussions. Methods should be tailored to individual needs and situations as far as possible. A distinction can be made between surveys (written, oral, open, closed), observations (self-observation, external observation, open, structured), simulations and role-playing, the evaluation of accessible data (e.g., comparative tests), and small and quick feedback methods.

Another key word in this context is triangulation. This means that an evaluation subject should be viewed from at least two perspectives and assessed using at least two different methodological approaches. Teacher self-evaluation is never sufficient; it must be supplemented by peer evaluation and student feedback. Questionnaires alone are insufficient; they should be supplemented by qualitative discussions or observation procedures. We would like to give some examples of different forms of evaluation. One form of reflection that is particularly useful for teachers is the reflection journal: The events of a teaching day are recorded in diary form or in response to questions, with the main focus on identifying successful situations and achievements in addition to problematic issues. The ideal duration for these records is approximately two weeks.

The individual entries should be summarized and evaluated after the self-reflection phase has been completed. Individual personal goals can be formulated based on the weaknesses identified, which one then attempts to achieve within a specified period of time.

When involving students in the evaluation of foreign language teaching, a number of fundamental aspects must be taken into account. Students are predestined to provide feedback because they are the actual target group of the teaching, they build on a longer, i.e., not fragmentary, background of experience, and they represent a broad sample, which minimizes distortions and errors. However, student feedback can overwhelm students: they have neither professional nor didactic competence with regard to teaching; the standards they apply are often unclear; information can be distorted by extreme attitudes, disparagement, or praise of the teacher. Forms of student feedback: Moderation methods offer many opportunities to record and evaluate student feedback in different ways. During the evaluation, misunderstandings are clarified, common goals are formulated, and implementation is planned. Quick but well-founded and differentiated feedback, e.g., on a double lesson or teaching sequence, can be achieved in the form of a “fishbowl” (discussion based on prepared questions about foreign language teaching). Quick, selective feedback can provide a mood barometer in addition to a flashlight at the end of the lesson.

A questionnaire is an easy-to-use and quick-to-evaluate method of assessment. For example, a survey on foreign language teaching can provide objective feedback on your strengths and weaknesses as a teacher beyond your own self-perception. If this is done using the same questionnaire over a longer period of time, changes and developments can also be interpreted.

As an example, let us cite a survey offered to students of the Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics. The survey is conducted electronically at the end of each academic semester and concerns the quality of academic disciplines, in particular foreign languages. The survey is anonymous, and the results are communicated to the teacher at the end of the session. Students are asked to rate the quality of the academic discipline on a 10-point scale, where 10.00 score – excellent level; 8.00–9.99 score – good level; 6.00–7.99 score – average level; 5.00–6.99 score – low level; 1.00–4.99 score – critically low level.

The survey covers the following aspects:

1. Organization and conducting of lectures.
2. Quality of the educational discipline content (relevance, curiosity, practical orientation).
3. Supporting the discipline by didactic and methodological materials for PLS.
4. Organization and conducting of practical classes / seminars, laboratory activities.
5. Using the interactive learning methods in classes. Presentation of results, role-playing and business games, moderation, case method, business simulation, etc.
6. The optimal amount of self-study.
7. Correspondence of score to the complexity of self-study tasks.
8. Quality of assessment. Highlighting the assessment criteria, review of work, compliance with the assessment criteria by the teacher during the process of work review, highlighting the grades.
9. Academic support. Availability of feedback from the teacher regarding consultations, availability of comments from the teacher regarding the performance of work (practical, laboratory, independent), informational support.
10. Availability of communication with the teacher: via PLS, mobile phone, messengers, e-mail, etc.
11. To what extent have your expectations of the educational discipline been met.
12. How did you attend classes in this educational discipline?
13. During the current semester, I attended practical/seminar, laboratory classes.
14. Please choose your course.
15. If you wish, leave a comment on this educational discipline.

As a further example, let us consider a survey offered to students at the language center of Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nuremberg. Students are asked to rate the quality of a foreign language course on a 5-point scale, where 1 score is excellent and 5 score is very bad. The survey covers the following aspects:

1. Your reasons for doing this course:
 - I need the ECTS credits for my main subject.
 - It's an elective / soft skills course.
 - Personal interest.
 - Other:
2. Average time spent on course preparation per week:
 - 0–30min • 30–60min • 60–120min • more than 2 hours
3. I found the level of difficulty ...
 - too high • just right • too low
4. I would rate my own commitment with regard to ...
 - a) preparation and homework:
 - b) active participation in class:
5. This is how I would rate the general conditions:
 - a) Venue:
 - b) Time:

- c) Class size:
- 6. I would rate the learning atmosphere in class ...
 - a) among students in class:
 - b) as created by the teacher:
- 7. Please rate the teaching itself:
 - a) Quality of the teaching materials used:
 - b) Use of additional media (visual aids, sound etc.)
 - c) Teacher's knowledge of subject area:
 - d) Teaching and presentation skills:
 - e) Interaction between teacher and students:
- 8. Teacher's availability for queries outside the classroom: (only to be answered if you actually tried to contact the teacher)
- 9. Overall assessment of the course:
- 10. Further comments and suggestions.

Let us analyze the structure and content of both questionnaires. What they have in common is that students are asked to provide an overall assessment of the course, evaluate the teaching materials, their quantity for independent study, academic support from the teacher and communication with them outside of class, the complexity of the course, in particular, tasks for independent study, and they can also leave their comments and suggestions.

However, the questionnaires also have differences. First, there is a difference in the grading scale: the Simon Kuznets KhNUE student questionnaire uses a 10-point scale, which can cause difficulties during assessment, such as a critically low level falling within the scale from 1.00 to 4.99. The Simon Kuznets KhNUE students must also indicate the extent to which their expectations regarding a given academic discipline have been met. The questionnaire for students at FAU Erlangen-Nuremberg includes questions about the purpose of choosing a particular academic discipline, the average weekly time spent preparing for the course, the general conditions of the course (location, time, number of students in the group), assessment of the learning atmosphere (among students and that created by the teacher), as well as assessment of their own contribution to the class.

In addition to evaluation in questionnaire form, media and collegial classroom observation (sitting in on classes) is also used. It is almost impossible for teachers to objectively assess the quality of their own teaching. Not only are they constantly distracted by hundreds of stimuli, tasks, and decisions during the lesson, but their subjective perception also prevents them from sufficiently dissociating themselves and becoming outside observers. Media recordings of lessons offer an important opportunity to do this.

Therefore, management the quality in foreign language classes is characterized by a combination of clear objectives, action-oriented approaches, feedback that promotes learning, a variety of methods, motivation, digital learning formats, and professional teaching skills. These characteristics enable sustainable, communicative, and autonomous language learning.

Bibliography:

1. Common European Framework of Reference for Language skills. Council of Europe Publishing, 2020. 200 p.
2. Hattie, J. Visible Learning for Teachers. Routledge, 2013. 286 p.
3. Leisen, J. Methoden-Handbuch Deutschsprachiger Fachunterricht. Regensburg, 2001. Pp. 473–495.
4. Vygotskij, L. Mind in Society. Harvard University Press, 1978. 176 p.
5. Walsh, S. Exploring Classroom Discourse. Routledge, 2011. 239 p.

References:

1. Common European Framework of Reference for Language skills (2020). Council of Europe Publishing. 200 p.
2. Hattie, J. (2013). Visible Learning for Teachers. Routledge. 286 p.
3. Leisen, J. (2001). Methoden-Handbuch Deutschsprachiger Fachunterricht [Methodology Handbook for Teaching Subjects in German]. Regensburg. Pp. 473-495 [in German].
4. Vygotskij, L. (1978). Mind in Society. Harvard University Press. 176 p.
5. Walsh, S. (2011). Exploring Classroom Discourse. Routledge. 239 p.

С. Анані, Д. Ципіна. Управління якістю заняття з іноземної мови

У статті розглядаються аспекти управління якістю заняття з іноземної мови. Підкреслюється, що це є ключовим фактором успішної мовної та міжкультурної освіти та результатом взаємодії когнітивних, афективних та соціальних компонентів. Підсумовано основні теоретичні та емпіричні характеристики якісного викладання іноземних мов.

До факторів, від яких залежить якість заняття з іноземної мови, належать змістовне спілкування та застосування різних соціальних форм роботи на занятті з іноземної мови. Соціальні форми (індивідуальна, партнерська, групова робота) варіюються, як і основні форми навчання. Детально проаналізовано репертуар методів оцінювання роботи вчителя: самооцінка вчителем уроків за допомогою щоденника рефлексій, записів на інформаційних носіях; відгуки учнів у формі коротких коментарів (флеш-відгуки, відгуки за системою «світлофор», метод «акваріум»), імпульсні запитання, (стандартизовані) анкети, анкети спостереження, цільові інтерв'ю та бесіди, оцінка модульної роботи; відгуки колег про записи на носіях інформації та їх обговорення, стажування й тп.

Наголошено на тому, що методи мають бути максимально адаптовані до індивідуальних потреб і ситуацій. Розрізняють опитування (письмові, усні, відкриті, закриті), спостереження (самоспостереження, зовнішнє спостереження, відкрите, структуроване), симуляції та рольові ігри, оцінку доступних даних (наприклад, порівняльні тести) та методи швидкого зворотного зв'язку в малих групах. Самооцінка викладача не є достатньою; її необхідно доповнювати оцінкою колеґ та зворотним зв'язком від студентів. В статті наведено приклади опитувань студентів щодо якості вивчення іноземної мови як навчальної дисципліни, проаналізовано спільні та відмінні риси.

Ключові слова: заняття з іноземної мови, здобувач вищої економічної освіти, опитування, управління якістю.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 23.02.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 27.03.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 22.05.2026



Стаття поширюється на умовах
ліцензії відкритого доступу
CC BY 4.0

CONTENTS

M. Abdulaiev. Diagnostics of crm skills formation among future managers in the context of professional training.....	5
S. Anani, D. Tsykina. Managing the quality of foreign language classes.....	12
H. Andriianova, N. Skora. Modern approaches to the use of AI platforms in education for effective pedagogical interaction.....	17
Yu. Baklazhenko. Principles of ESP Instruction in the Paradigm of Artificial Intelligence Integration.....	21
O. Butylina, O. Puzyryova. The Organization of Resilience Centers as a Management Response to the Heightened Needs of the Population Amidst the War in Ukraine.....	28
L. Vieilandie. “Exit Tickets” Technology as a Method of Real-Time Educational Process Correction.....	33
O. Holyshev. Labor market and professional competence of skilled construction workers.....	38
S. Grynenko. Transformation of traditional methodologies of teaching guitar ensemble performance in the contemporary artistic space.....	43
O. Huz. Ways of improving the quality of teaching German as a second foreign language.....	47
O. Durmanenko. Adaptation of first-year students of professional pre-higher education to the educational environment of a higher education institution.....	52
I. Yevdokymova. Supervision in social work: organizational practices and barriers to implementation in social services in Ukraine (on the example of the Kharkiv region).....	59
T. Zhyrova. Theoretical foundations of the instructor-mentor’s role in training IT professionals in higher education institutions under conditions of widespread AI adoption.....	64
M. Zhumbei. Multilingualism as a factor in the professional mobility of future tourism managers.....	69
N. Zobenko, S. Potiuk. Inclusive resource center in the system of interdisciplinary interaction of psychological and pedagogical support for children with special educational needs in a preschool education institution.....	75
V. Ihnatenko. Analytical reading of literary texts as a means of developing students’ translation competence (based on the material from ‘Le petit prince’ by A. de Saint-Exupéry).....	81
N. Kotenko. International experience in developing future it specialists’ professional competence in the context of sustainable development.....	89
A. Koshel, V. Koshel, D. Frolova, D. Ochkovska. Conceptual approaches to the transformation of the health-saving paradigm of physical education for preschoolers under martial law.....	95
O. Kravchenko-Dzondza. Developing literary competence in future primary school teachers during their professional training.....	99
V. Kuryliak. Axiological Paradigm of Higher Education in the Context of Post-Secular Transition: The Experience of Implementing Value-Oriented Disciplines in the Educational Space of the Ukrainian Institute of Arts and Sciences.....	104
L. Lukina. The Role of Information and Communication Technologies in Creating an Authentic Foreign Language Communicative Environment in Polish Language Classes.....	110
I. Matiichyn, V. Sali. Studying spiritual music in music classes (based on materials from New ukrainian school textbooks).....	115
L. Mesarosh. Research on the formation of logical-mathematical competence in the educational process from preschool to higher education institutions.....	120
S. Mykytiuk, V. Mykytiuk. The Concept of the Ideal Lesson in the Pedagogical Views of E. F. Hughes (Late 19th Century).....	125
Н. Мироненко, С. Панчишин, М. Опир. Автентичні медіа у викладанні іноземних мов під час кризи: досвід України, США та Європи.....	131
O. Mykhailenko. Fairy-tale therapy in psychological and pedagogical correction for learners with hearing loss.....	135

Наукове видання

**НАУКОВИЙ ЧАСОПИС
УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ДЕРЖАВНОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ
ІМЕНІ МИХАЙЛА ДРАГОМАНОВА**

Серія 5. Педагогічні науки: реалії та перспективи

Випуск 109

Матеріали подані мовою оригіналу

Головний редактор серії – В. М. Слабко

Відповідальний редактор серії – Л. Л. Макаренко

Технічний редактор – Н. С. Корцигіна

Верстка – О. І. Молодецька

Дата розміщення онлайн – 22.05.2026 р.

Дата друку – 25.05.2026 р.

Формат 60x84/8. Гарнітура Times New Roman.

Папір офсет. Цифровий друк. Обл.-вид. арк. 30,45. Ум. друк. арк. 30.64.

Замов. № 0526/528. Наклад 300 прим.

Віддруковано з оригіналів

Друкарня – Видавничий дім «Гельветика»

65101, м. Одеса, вул. Інглєзі, 6/1

Телефони +38 (095) 934 48 28, +38 (097) 723 06 08

E-mail: mailbox@helvetica.ua

Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи

ДК № 7623 від 22.06.2022 р.