

SOFIIA RUSOVA'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF FORMING CHILDREN'S INTELLECTUAL CULTURE

prof. Oleksandra Yankovych

Kujawsko-Pomorska Szkoła Wyższa w Bydgoszczy

email: o.jankovych@akp.bydgoszcz.pl, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4253-5954>

Streszczenie: The article presents the views of Ukrainian educator, public figure, and writer Sofiia Rusova (1856–1940) on the ways and means of forming mental abilities, skills, values, and mental processes in preschool and primary school children – an important contribution to the theory and practice of developing intellectual culture. She emphasised the need to connect intellectual education with moral, aesthetic, physical, religious, and labour education. advocated teaching children to make efforts to achieve goals and to develop self-discipline. Rusova regarded nature studies as both a vital source of knowledge and the best discipline for the mind. She also believed that national school could provide a true foundation for mutual assistance among the peoples of the world.

The following ideas of Sofiia Rusova remain relevant today: the organisation of education that leads to a child's desire for self-directed learning; the development of mental skills, humanistic and aesthetic values, and spirituality of a child; the integration of language development with thinking through the use of folk art and literary works, particularly those related to nature; and the use of positive (beneficial) suggestion by teachers.

Słowa kluczowe: intellectual culture, culture of intellectual work, means, methods, formation of intellectual culture, intellectual education, preschool children, primary school students, Sofiia Rusova.

Introduction

One of the key tasks of preschool education institutions and schools is to cultivate a culture of intellectual work in children. The development of such a culture affects not only the level of knowledge and competences of preschool and primary school students, but also their capacity for self-education – a key soft skill of the 21st century.

This has led to increased interest in contemporary research on methods for forming children's intellectual culture. At the same time, there is a growing need for a retrospective analysis of the works of classical pedagogical thinkers.

Their works often reflect important ideas that have been forgotten over time or have not

received due recognition. It is understandable that in the face of today's societal challenges, educators tend to focus primarily on innovative developments. At times, it is claimed that works written half a century or even a century ago have lost their relevance – that they were useful only in the context of their time. However, some of these works, written a century ago, still resonate with contemporary issues.

Among the prominent figures of the past who made a significant contribution to the development of a culture of intellectual work is the Ukrainian public figure, founder of the first Ukrainian kindergarten, and writer Sofiia Rusova. Her legacy is multifaceted: it encompasses the theory and practice of preschool education, the nationalisation of schools, the social and religious education of children, and more. She made a profound contribution to pedagogy, the history of pedagogy, social pedagogy, and psychology.

At the same time, certain aspects of Rusova's legacy – particularly the development of learning to learn, the capacity for self-development, and the formation of intellectual culture and a culture of intellectual work – warrant deeper attention.

The Concepts of “Intellectual Culture” and “Culture of Intellectual Work” in Scientific Discourse

In academic literature, scholars operate with the terms “mental culture,” “intellectual culture,” and “culture of intellectual work”.

Mental and intellectual culture are essentially synonymous, referring to the set of knowledge, skills, and values a person acquires throughout life.

At first glance, the concepts of intellectual culture and culture of intellectual work may appear identical; however, important distinctions exist. Scholars also differentiate between the intellectual culture of society and the intellectual culture of the individual¹.

A. Zybala defines intellectual culture as a community's inclination toward the objective analysis of socially significant issues, or as a mechanism for the analytical examination of problems and the pursuit of optimal solutions based on transparent and rationally justified criteria². This interpretation refers to the “intellectual culture of society.”

Intellectual culture is also described as a domain of processes shaping modern thought, which is manifested in the ability to express such thought through abstraction that is less dependent on context, and in the conscious construction of alternative systems of thought formation³.

1 A. Zybala, *Wokół kultury umysłowej w Polsce – jej źródła i przejawy* [On intellectual culture in Poland – its sources and expressions], “Kultura i społeczeństwo” 2017, 4.

2 Ibidem.

3 Ibidem.

Intellectual culture cannot be equated with folk wisdom (as expressed in proverbs), common sense, or everyday thinking⁴.

In analysing the term “intellectual culture of society,” scholars note its connection to the theory and practice of intercultural education, as it elevates people above the contradictions that divide them and unites them through bonds of universal solidarity, thereby also enabling the achievement of the goals set for intercultural education⁵.

In his research on intellectual culture, Marek Rembierz draws on Tadeusz Czeżowski's assertion that intellectual culture sensitises individuals to truth and falsehood, to correct reasoning and logical fallacies; it awakens a “logical conscience” – the foundation of a critical attitude towards oneself as well as towards other people. At the same time, his work reflects an approach to understanding intellectual culture within the context of personality development – namely, as the acquisition and cultivation of cognitive abilities⁶.

In the structure of intellectual culture, K. Tambovska identified intellectual skills as its core element. These include the ability to analyse, systematise, compare, generalise, identify key points, substantiate arguments, and more⁷. Intellectual culture, she argues, requires personal activity and engagement⁸.

An analysis of scholarly works provides grounds to assert that the intellectual culture of an individual – as a component of general culture – represents a set of knowledge, abilities, skills, and values that support mental activity, the purposeful development of cognitive abilities, self-development, and self-education.

The culture of intellectual work is a component of intellectual culture.

The culture of intellectual work is a complex psychological and pedagogical phenomenon – a personality trait that reflects the level of development of an individual's intellectual, cognitive, research, and organisational qualities, which ensure the rationality and high productivity of mental activity⁹.

Motivation plays a key role in the development of an individual's culture of intellectual work. It encompasses a positive attitude toward both the content and process of learning, the effective mastery of knowledge and methods of activity, and the mobilisation of moral and volitional efforts aimed at achieving educational and cognitive goals, all of which require personal initiative¹⁰.

4 Ibidem.

5 M. Rembierz, *Kultura intelektualna, wrażliwości metodologiczne i refleksja metapedagogiczna w rozwijaniu teorii i praktyki edukacji międzykulturowej* [Intellectual culture, methodological challenges, and metapedagogical reflection in the development of intercultural education theory and practice], “Edukacja międzykulturowa” 2017, 2 (7).

6 Ibidem.

7 K. V. Tambovska, *Intelektualna kultura yak skladova yakisnoi osvity* [Intellectual culture as a component of quality education], “Nauka i osvita” 2014, 3, p. 167.

8 Ibidem, p. 166.

9 A. Podufalov, *Metodychni shliakhy vykhovannia kultury rozumovoi pratsi molodshykh shkolariv* [Methodological approaches to fostering the culture of intellectual work in primary school students], “Pedahohika bezpeky” 2021, 1 (5), p. 59.

10 K. D. Sachava, *Formuvannia kultury rozumovoi pratsi molodshykh pidlitkiv* [The formation of a culture of intellectual work in early adolescents], “Science and Education a New Dimension:

The goal of fostering a culture of intellectual work in children is to develop their readiness to engage in diverse forms of activity within both society and the natural environment, and to cultivate a holistic worldview – one that is continually reinterpreted and enriched with new intellectual and emotional nuances of meaning¹¹.

The culture of intellectual work presupposes learning to learn. Its development fosters such essential personal qualities as work capacity, willpower, cognitive and work-related activity, independence, as well as inclination toward and love for work in general, and for intellectual work in particular¹².

The distinction between intellectual culture and the culture of intellectual work lies in their focus: the culture of work emphasises the process, whereas intellectual culture centres on the outcome – namely, the development of thinking. Intellectual culture is regarded as a broader concept than the culture of intellectual work.

Intellectual education is a theme in Rusova's pedagogical works (although she did not explicitly use the terms intellectual culture, mental culture, or culture of intellectual work). Her insights into the development of mental abilities, skills, and values in preschool and primary school children – considered within the context of psychology and physiology – remain little known to today's educators, yet they continue to be relevant almost a century after they were written. Ultimately, the figure of Sofiia Rusova – a prominent Ukrainian educator, public intellectual, and writer – remains insufficiently known outside Ukraine. Her ideas deserve greater visibility and broader representation in contemporary educational discourse.

The Life of Sofiia Rusova

Sofiia Rusova was born on 18 February 1856 in the village of Oleshnia, in the Chernihiv region. Although she was not Ukrainian by origin, she became Ukrainian in spirit. Her father, Fedir Lindfors, was Swedish, and her mother, Anna Gervais, was French. Her mother died when Sofiia was four years old. Until the age of ten, she lived in Oleshnia with her father and older sister. In 1866, the family moved to Kyiv. Rusova studied at the Fundukliiv Gymnasium, graduating in 1870. Her father died a year later.

Having studied the works of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Diesterweg, and Froebel, Sofiia and her sister Maria opened the first Ukrainian Froebelian kindergarten in Kyiv in 1871. It became a center of Ukrainian national culture.

In 1874, Sofiia married Oleksandr Rusov. Together, they became deeply

Pedagogy and Psychology” 2013, 3, p. 135.

- 11 A. Podufalov, *Metodychni shliakhy vykhovannia kultury rozumovoi pratsi molodshykh shkolariv* [Methodological approaches to fostering the culture of intellectual work in primary school students], “Pedahohika bezpeky” 2021, 1 (5), p. 59.
- 12 K. D. Sachava, *Formuvannia kultury rozumovoi pratsi molodshykh pidlitiv* [The formation of a culture of intellectual work in early adolescents], “Science and Education a New Dimension: Pedagogy and Psychology” 2013, 3, p. 135.

involved in public and cultural life. She actively participated in the work of local communities and Prosvita Societies, including the founding of kindergartens, primary schools, libraries, theatre productions, lecture programmes, and publishing activities. Beginning in 1881, she was imprisoned several times for her ties to revolutionary circles.

In 1909, Rusova worked as a lecturer in pedagogy at the Froebel Women's Institute, which trained staff for preschool institutions, and also taught French at the Commercial Institute.

She played an active role in the political and cultural life during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, heading the Department of Extracurricular and Preschool Education at the Ministry of Public Education.

Beginning in 1919, she delivered a course of lectures in pedagogy at the First Ukrainian University in Kamianets-Podilskyi.

From 1923, Rusova resided in Prague. The Soviet regime declared her an enemy of the Ukrainian people and a bourgeois nationalist, as she had dedicated her life to the revival of the Ukrainian nation. She was also one of the first to raise international awareness about the Holodomor and the genocide of Ukrainian intellectuals in the USSR, Galicia, Bukovyna, and Transcarpathia¹³.

She died in 1940 and was buried in Prague.

Rusova considered the intellectual development of preschoolers and primary school children to be one of the most important pedagogical issues. This focus is reflected in her works *Preschool Education*, *Theory and Practice of Preschool Education*, *New School*, *Didactics*, and others. Her pedagogical views were largely oriented toward the development of the mind, mental processes, cognitive abilities, and related domains, which makes them particularly relevant in the context of forming intellectual culture.

Tasks, Methods, and Means of Forming Children's Intellectual Culture in the Works of Sofia Rusova

Among the key pedagogical issues, Rusova explored the development of children's thinking, ideas, and mental functions. She outlined methods and means for fostering these in both preschoolers and primary school students. Importantly, Rusova emphasized the outcome of this process – the ability to build interpersonal relationships grounded in values.

In Rusova's pedagogical legacy, intellectual education is closely intertwined with moral, aesthetic, physical, religious, labour, and other aspects of education. She

¹³ O. Dzhus, *Zhyttia i tvorchist Sofii Fedorivny Rusovoi (1856–1940): naukovo-metodychnyi posibnyk* [The life and work of Sofia Fedorivna Rusova (1856–1940): a scientific and methodological guide], 2016, p. 5.

considered learning to be a component of comprehensive upbringing:

“Learning becomes a part, a branch of comprehensive upbringing, which, subject to this task, cultivates the intellectual dimension of upbringing, the development of the mind, imagination, thought, ideas, views, and knowledge; it offers those treasures that guide human relationships”¹⁴.

She also defined the goal of learning as follows: “The main task of learning is to awaken an interest in science, truth, goodness, and beauty, and to coordinate movement for the best performance of all skills”¹⁵.

Rusova expressed these ideas in her work *Didactics*, which was first published almost a century ago. However, they remain relevant in today’s context.

In formulating this learning objective, Rusova articulated several important ideas: the organisation of learning in such a way that it fosters a child’s desire for self-directed learning, as well as the formation of skills and humanistic, moral, and aesthetic values. In contemporary education, this objective would be interpreted as the development of learning to learn as a key competence – an essential component of a schoolchild’s culture of intellectual work.

Rusova also expressed the need to develop the mind, independence, and social qualities in their interrelation – all of which are components of intellectual culture – in her well-substantiated ideal of learning:

“The ideal of learning is, first and foremost, the development of the student’s mind and thinking towards the greatest possible independence and the cultivation of a strong sense of solidarity in school work within a well-structured school team”¹⁶.

Rusova also addressed the development of skills that form part of intellectual culture, and the cultivation of cognitive abilities grounded in the development of the nervous system. By that time, the connection between pedagogy, psychology, and physiology had already been substantiated, in particular thanks to the works of the Ukrainian educator Kostiantyn Ushynskyi. Rusova also incorporated the achievements of these sciences into her own work. She wrote: “The education of the mind is the education of the nervous system.” She further observed that “...the nervous system of every child retains a large number of undeveloped, immature cells that serve no purpose, leaving various potentials unused, although their development might contribute to the making of a genius”¹⁷.

Intellectual culture is a component of a person’s overall culture, and it is inseparable from spirituality – an aspect to which Rusova drew attention. A quotation she cited from the Eastern poet Tagore served as a guideline for her contemporaries: “Do not drive God or Nature out of school; let your students live a spiritual life”¹⁸.

¹⁴ S. Rusova, *Dydaktyka* [Didactics], [in:] S. Rusova, *Výbrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2*, za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997, p. 190. Here and hereafter, all translations of the quotations from Ukrainian are by the author.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 234.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 191.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 300.

Rusova substantiated the means and methods of forming the intellectual culture of preschool and primary school children.

She outlined the content of education in kindergartens and primary schools.

Rusova believed that children of preschool age are primarily interested in nature, technology, and work, and therefore should be given knowledge in nature studies and technology appropriate to their level of understanding.

She wrote: "Nature studies should be at the forefront of elementary education – as a source of the most essential scientific knowledge, as the best discipline of the mind that accustoms a child to careful observation and consistent conclusions, and as a subject that has the strongest moral and aesthetic influence on a child's education"¹⁹.

Nature studies is closely connected with working the land – agricultural labour. While working in the garden or vegetable patch, children not only have the opportunity to observe, but also develop the creative powers and abilities that lie dormant deep within them²⁰. At the same time, the educator emphasised the need for manual work – modelling, weaving, embroidery – demonstrating its integration with art²¹.

Rusova also saw a connection between nature studies and language development, to which she gave considerable attention, and she regarded the study of mathematics as essential. She noted: "The formal sciences – mathematics and the native language – are also of great and undeniable importance"²².

Rusova viewed the native word and language as a source of national worldview, as it is through language that children perceive, reflect on, and make sense of the surrounding reality. Language shapes a child's mind and heart, becomes a means of communication, and determines the degree of the child's development. Rusova wrote: "The main value of language is not in the language itself, but in the fact that, as soon as a child masters it, it becomes the primary tool for acquiring knowledge"²³.

Drawing on then-current psychological and pedagogical research that emphasized the close link between language and thinking – and the inseparable unity of language and thought – Rusova stressed: "Language shapes a child's thinking, guides it, and leads the child along the path of developing general culture"²⁴. She concluded that the central goal in the development of preschoolers' language is to awaken their mental abilities and teach them to express their thoughts clearly and correctly²⁵.

19 S. Rusova, *Nova shkola* [A new school], [in:] Rusova S., *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997, p. 7.*

20 S. Rusova, *Doshkilne vykhovannia* [Preschool education], [in:] Rusova S., *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory, Osvita, Kyiv 1996, pp. 97–98.*

21 S. Rusova, *Nova shkola* [A new school], [in:] Rusova S., *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997, pp. 66, 69.*

22 *Ibidem*, p. 7.

23 S. Rusova, *Doshkilne vykhovannia* [Preschool education], [in:] Rusova S. *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory, Osvita, Kyiv 1996, p. 117.*

24 *Ibidem*.

25 O. V. Kovalenko, *Literaturna spadshchyna Sofii Rusovoi: pohliad kriz chas* [The literary legacy of Sofii Rusova: a view through time]. *Pedahohichna osvita: teoriia i praktyka. Zbirnyk*

It should be noted that whatever aspect of educational institutions might have been considered by Rusova – history, geography, science, music or singing – she stressed the need for a focus on the individual, development of skills, natural strengths, and talents²⁶.

Among the means of teaching, Rusova placed particular emphasis on literary works and fairy tales. In her work *The New School*, she highlighted that the main task of both the teacher and the school is to develop students' thinking and language. Fairy tales and nature stories, she argued, are particularly effective in achieving this goal²⁷. This great educator not only offered guidance on how to select literary works for working with children, but also authored children's literature herself²⁸.

Rusova identified methods for the intellectual development of children.

One of the key methods was excursions and walks, because “nothing else, like nature, provides so much interesting and diverse material for learning; nothing else develops independent thinking – comparison, observation, analysis, and synthesis – as much as the constant study of various facts and phenomena of nature through direct contact with it”²⁹. While studying nature, children develop a love for it, because when they acquire the ability to observe and explore their surroundings, it teaches them to love their native land, their homeland, as something unique³⁰. Rusova recommended: “Let students be surrounded by familiar things so that they become attached to them, learn to love everything native, and devote all their mental and physical energy to it”³¹.

According to the educator, thinking, memory, and mental abilities should be developed through various exercises and logical operations, by involving children in the independent formulation of conclusions.

Rusova substantiated the necessity of applying the catechetical method of teaching, which takes the form of a dialogue between the teacher and students³².

To support knowledge acquisition and the formation of intellectual culture, she

naukovykh prats. Vyp. 11, 2012, p. 157.

- 26 M. Chepil, *Problemy vychovannia dzieci w pedagogicznej koncepcji Sofii Rusovej* [Problems of child upbringing in Sofia Rusova's pedagogical concept], “*Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, sectio J – Paedagogia-Psychologia*” 2017, 29 (2).
- 27 K. S. Moroz, *Sofia Rusova pro rozumove vykhovannia molodshykh shkoliariv zasobamy pryrody* [Sofia Rusova on the intellectual education of primary school students through nature], “*Naukovyi visnyk Donbasu*” 2013, 1.
- 28 S. Rusova, *Sered ridnoi pryrody. Opovidannia* [Amongst native nature. Short stories], Ukrainske vydavnytstvo v Katerynoslavi, Kyiv–Liaiptsig 1922.
- 29 K. S. Moroz, *Sofia Rusova pro rozumove vykhovannia molodshykh shkoliariv zasobamy pryrody* [Sofia Rusova on the intellectual education of primary school students through nature], “*Naukovyi visnyk Donbasu*” 2013, 1, p. 2.
- 30 *Ibidem*, p. 3.
- 31 S. Rusova, *Nova shkola* [A new school], [in:] Rusova S. *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid*, Kyiv 1997, p. 15.
- 32 S. Rusova, *Dydaktyka* [Didactics], [in:] Rusova S. *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid*, Kyiv 1997, p. 238.

advised using student reports followed by group discussions involving all students³³.

Opposing scholasticism and rote memorization, Rusova advocated for the development of children's intellect in a way that would enable them to apply it in real life.

She placed great importance on children's play as both a means and a method of learning:

"Play allows all the child's abilities to manifest. One cannot think without acting, because a child constantly needs movement. Play affects a child more deeply than learning or work because it engages various capacities, not just the intellect. Today, too little emotional content is brought into education; science and learning must be brought closer to life. The method of play corresponds to the nature of children and can be applied to any subject"³⁴.

Play fosters mental flexibility, develops attention, self-control, and agility³⁵.

Rusova analysed the game classifications developed by scholars of her time, identifying mental games and games that develop cognitive abilities as a distinct category. These include "riddles, lotto, and unfinished stories"³⁶. Play, she believed, is a manifestation of independent learning and self-discipline. Rusova also emphasised the benefits of drama and theatrical performances³⁷.

In reading lessons, with the aim of developing memory, she recommended having children memorise poems and fairy tales.

According to Rusova, an interesting and useful technique is to involve children in drawing and creating illustrations for the stories, fairy tales, and poems they have heard³⁸.

She also suggested "illustrating certain stories with music played on the piano or violin, explaining different moments"³⁹.

In her pursuit of developing intellectual culture, Rusova was far ahead of her time. She wrote her work *Didactics* about a hundred years ago, yet her words remain strikingly relevant today:

"The most significant fact of the modern era must be recognised as the fact that all aspects of the world have come into mutual contact, raising the question: will they or certain groups among them continue to destroy one another, or will they find a true foundation for mutual support? Such a foundation can only be the school – the

³³ Ibidem, p. 231.

³⁴ Ibidem, p. 230.

³⁵ S. Rusova, *Nova shkola sotsialnoho vykhovannia* [A new school of social education.], [in:] Rusova S. *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997, p. 64.*

³⁶ Ibidem.

³⁷ S. Rusova, *Dydaktyka* [Didactics], [in:] Rusova S. *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997, p. 231.*

³⁸ S. Rusova, *Doshkilne vykhovannia* [Preschool education], [in:] Rusova S. *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory, Osvita, Kyiv 1996, p. 93.*

³⁹ S. Rusova, *Nova shkola* [A new school], [in:] Rusova S. *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997, p. 69.*

national school of each people”⁴⁰.

Rusova attributed a significant role to the personality of the teacher in developing children’s intellectual culture. She emphasised the teachers’ noble mission – to lead their people out of darkness, ignorance, and oppression⁴¹.

Rusova’s reflections on the teacher’s ability to motivate children to make an effort and foster independence are essential for the formation of intellectual culture. In her work *Didactics*, she wrote:

“All learning in modern schools is carried out in close cooperation between teachers and students. The teacher must proceed slowly, adhering to a clear path and method, sometimes requiring even great effort from the student – but the teacher must move forward without stopping. ... It is the teacher’s duty to elicit the necessary effort ... to awaken students to independent inquiry, to the independent search for necessary material”⁴².

Rusova believed that “the teacher should not overly simplify learning; the child’s intellectual abilities must be engaged”⁴³. The teacher must “foster a conscious attitude toward one’s responsibilities, a sense of accountability”⁴⁴.

For young children, the teacher should make learning more like play, but never turn it into undisciplined fun⁴⁵.

Rusova emphasised the importance of a teacher’s use of positive (beneficial) suggestion. She noted that suggestion is a powerful factor in social education: it can be highly beneficial in many cases, but also very harmful – not only because it can incline a child toward bad behaviour, but also because prolonged suggestion can weaken a child’s will⁴⁶.

Teachers have the opportunity to use both beneficial and harmful suggestion on a daily basis. Through the latter, they can completely undermine the mood of their students and impair their development. Therefore, it is important to remember that the more we perceive children as good, the more they actually become so – and the opposite is also true⁴⁷.

The family plays a crucial role in a child’s overall development and, in particular, in forming their intellectual culture. “From one’s lineage to the people and the nation – this is the natural path of development for every child, the formation and growth of their personality, patriotic attitude, national consciousness, and civic

40 S. Rusova, *Dydaktyka* [*Didactics*], [in:] Rusova S. *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997, p. 300.*

41 *Ibidem*, p. 240.

42 *Ibidem*, p. 191.

43 *Ibidem*, p. 238.

44 *Ibidem*, p. 239.

45 *Ibidem*, p. 238.

46 S. Rusova, *Teoriia i praktyka doshkilnoho vykhovannia* [*Theory and practice of preschool education*], [in:] Rusova S. *Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 1 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997, p. 200.*

47 *Ibidem*, p. 201.

maturity”⁴⁸.

Rusova's ideas on how to respond to societal challenges, the role of school in social progress, and the need to end violence – in line with the goals of sustainable development – remain strikingly relevant today. Her greatest achievement lies not only in her development of approaches to forming the intellectual culture of preschool and primary school children in the 20th century, but in her concern for building a true foundation for mutual assistance among the peoples of the world through the creation of a new national school.

Conclusions

The creative legacy of the Ukrainian public figure, educator, and writer Sofia Rusova gives a prominent place to the issues of intellectual education, the development of thinking, creative imagination, and abilities – those essential skills that constitute an individual's intellectual culture. Her ideas concerning the methods and means of forming intellectual culture among preschool and primary school children remain relevant today.

In particular, when cultivating an interest in learning, it is also necessary to accustom children to making effort in pursuit of goals and to developing self-discipline.

When outlining the content of education in kindergarten and primary school, Rusova prioritised nature studies, language development, mathematics, manual work, drawing, and other subjects. She also attached great importance to religious education, warning that neither God nor Nature should be driven out of the school, since this is how the value-based aspect of intellectual culture is ensured.

Effective ways of forming the intellectual culture of preschool and primary school children include excursions, walks, games, dramatizations, theatrical performances, student reports with group discussions, completing unfinished stories, drawing illustrations for listened-to stories, fairy tales, and poems, as well as engaging in manual activities such as modelling, embroidery, and weaving.

Effective methods include conversations and storytelling, while effective means include literary works and folk art – fairy tales, proverbs, sayings, songs, poems, and riddles.

The teacher's role is essential in forming intellectual culture – particularly their ability to encourage effort in children and to foster independence.

Rusova saw the creation of a national school as a true foundation for mutual support among peoples at a time when all aspects of the world had come into contact with each other.

⁴⁸ M. Chepil, O. Karpenko, *Wychowanie dzieci w rodzinie ukraińskiej: historiografia problemu* [Upbringing of children in Ukrainian families: historiography of the issue], “Pedagogika Rodziny” 2013, 3 (4), p. 160.

At the present stage, the following ideas of Rusova remain highly relevant and promising:

- the organisation of education in such a way that it fosters a child's desire for self-directed learning;
- the development of mental abilities, humanistic and aesthetic values, and spirituality in children;
- the use of nature as a source of knowledge, a means of developing intellectual skills, and a way to nurture love for one's native land;
- the development of language in connection with thinking, supported by folk art and literary works, especially those about nature;
- the use of positive (beneficial) suggestion by teachers and encouraging students to make intellectual effort and develop independence.

Bibliography

- Chepil M., Karpenko O., Wychowanie dzieci w rodzinie ukraińskiej: historio- grafia problemu [Upbringing of children in Ukrainian families: historiography of the issue], "Pedagogika Rodziny" 2013, 3 (4).
- Chepil M., Problemy wychowania dzieci w pedagogicznej koncepcji Sofii Rusovej [Problems of child upbringing in Sofia Rusova's pedagogical concept], "Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, sectio J – Paedagogia-Psychologia" 2017, 29.
- Dzhus O., Zhyttia i tvorchist Sofii Fedorivny Rusovoi (1856–1940): naukovo- metodychnyi posibnyk [The life and work of Sofia Fedorivna Rusova (1856–1940): a scientific and methodological guide], 2016.
- Kovalenko O. V., Literaturna spadshchyna Sofii Rusovoi: pohliad kriz chas [The literary legacy of Sofia Rusova: a view through time]. Pedahohichna osvita: teoriia i praktyka. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Vyp. 11, 2012.
- Moroz K. S., Sofia Rusova pro rozumove vykhovannia molodshykh shkoliariv zasobamy pryrody [Sofia Rusova on the intellectual education of primary school students through nature], "Naukovyi visnyk Donbasu" 2013, 1.
- Podufalov A., Metodychni shliakhy vykhovannia kultury rozumovoi pratsi molodshykh shkoliariv [Methodological approaches to fostering the culture of intellectual work in primary school students], "Pedahohika bezpeky" 2021, 1 (5).
- Rembierz M., Kultura intelektualna, wątpliwości metodologiczne i refleksja metapedagogiczna w rozwijaniu teorii i praktyki edukacji międzykulturowej [Intellectual culture, methodological challenges, and metapedagogical reflection in the development of intercultural education theory and practice], "Edukacja międzykulturowa" 2017, 2 (7).
- Rusova S., Doshkilne vykhovannia [Preschool education], [in:] Rusova S. Vy-

- brani pedahohichni tvory, Osvita, Kyiv 1996.
- Rusova S., Dydaktyka [Didactics], [in:] Rusova S., Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997.
 - Rusova S., Nova shkola [A new school], [in:] Rusova S., Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997.
 - Rusova S., Nova shkola sotsialnoho vykhovannia [A new school of social education.], [in:] Rusova S., Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 2 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997.
 - Rusova S., Sered ridnoi pryrody. Opovidannia [Amongst native nature. Short stories], Ukrainiske vydavnytstvo v Katerynoslavi, Kyiv–Liaiptsig 1922.
 - Rusova S., Teoriiia i praktyka doshkilnoho vykhovannia [Theory and practice of preschool education], [in:] Rusova S., Vybrani pedahohichni tvory: u 2 kn. Kn. 1 / za red. Ye. I. Kovalenko; uporiad., peredm., prym. Ye. I. Kovalenko, I. M. Pinchuk, Lybid, Kyiv 1997.
 - Sachava K. D., *Formuvannia kultury rozumovoi pratsi molodshykh pidlitkiv [The formation of a culture of intellectual work in early adolescents]*, “Science and Education a New Dimension: Pedagogy and Psychology” 2013, 3.
 - Tambovska K. V., Intelktualna kultura yak skladova yakisnoi osvity [Intellectual culture as a component of quality education], “Nauka i osvita” 2014, 3.
 - Zybala A., Wokół kultury umysłowej w Polsce – jej źródła i przejawy [On intellectual culture in Poland – its sources and expressions], “Kultura i społeczeństwo” 2017, 4.

WKŁAD SOFII RUSOWEJ W TEORIĘ I PRAKTYKĘ KSZTAŁTOWANIA KULTURY INTELEKTUALNEJ DZIECI

Streszczenie: W artykule przedstawiono poglądy pedagoga, działaczki społecznej i pisarki Sofii Rusowej (1856–1940) dotyczące sposobów i środków kształtowania zdolności intelektualnych, umiejętności, wartości oraz procesów psychicznych u dzieci w wieku przedszkolnym i uczniów klas młodszych. Poglądy te stanowią istotny wkład w teorię i praktykę rozwoju kultury intelektualnej.

S. Rusowa podkreślała konieczność ścisłego powiązania wychowania intelektualnego z wychowaniem moralnym, estetycznym, fizycznym, religijnym oraz wychowaniem przez pracę. Zalecała kształtowanie u dzieci nawyku podejmowania wysiłku w dążeniu do osiągnięcia celu oraz rozwijanie samodyscypliny. Uważała przyrodę za jedno z podstawowych źródeł wiedzy oraz najlepszą „dyscyplinę umysłu”.

Autorka akcentowała również ważną rolę narodowej szkoły w budowaniu wzajemnej pomocy

i współpracy między narodami świata.

W warunkach współczesnych szczególnie aktualne pozostają następujące idee S. Rusowej: organizacja procesu nauczania sprzyjająca kształtowaniu dążenia dziecka do samokształcenia; rozwój umiejętności intelektualnych, wartości humanistycznych i estetycznych oraz duchowości; rozwój języka w ścisłym związku z rozwojem myślenia z wykorzystaniem twórczości ludowej i literatury pięknej, zwłaszcza o tematyce przyrodniczej; a także stosowanie przez nauczycieli pozytywnej (konstruktywnej) sugestii.

Słowa kluczowe: kultura intelektualna, kultura pracy umysłowej, środki i metody kształtowania kultury umysłowej, wychowanie umysłowe, dzieci w wieku przedszkolnym, uczniowie klas młodszych, Sofia Rusowa.