



здійснюють узагальнення отриманих результатів та розробку ефективних педагогічних технологій. Останні доводяться до широкого педагогічного загалу через інформаційні мережі і дистанційні форми навчання, а також є предметом тематичних курсів підвищення кваліфікації. Вся післядипломна освіта проводиться на наукових основах і сприяє розвитку наукового потенціалу загальноосвітніх середніх закладів.

У методологічному плані детальної розробки потребують проблеми реалізації державних освітніх програм через структури післядипломної освіти, формування громадських органів управління післядипломних закладів освіти, впровадження ринкових елементів взаємовідносин між післядипломними освітніми закладами та споживачами їх послуг, формування поліархічної системи управління на регіональному рівні та перерозподілу організаційно-управлінських функцій. Одна з найважливіших проблем пов'язана з конституюванням статусу регіональних інститутів післядипломної освіти як головних координувальних та інформаційних структур в регіональній системі шкільної освіти. Оскільки уряд взяв курс на посилення державного керівництва в освітній сфері, проекти позбавити державні органи управління освітою функцій директивного контролю відійшли на задній план, а відтак пропонувані їм функції моніторингу, інформаційного забезпечення та координування фактично повисли в повітрі. З нашої точки зору, їх доцільно закріпити саме за регіональними інститутами післядипломної освіти, відповідно закріпивши за ними статус координаційно-моніторингових регіональних центрів та забезпечивши відповідне фінансування.

Характеризуючи діяльність Дніпропетровського обласного інституту післядипломної педагогічної освіти на основі означених вище характеристик інноваційного розвитку, слід вказати на такі наші досягнення:

1. Щороку в інституті проходить навчання близько 15 тис. освітян всіх категорій за 117 напрямками, і при масштабах нашої області забезпечити процес підвищення кваліфікації та перепідготовки освітян без спеціалізованого інституту неможливо.
2. Інститут – чи не єдиний в Україні серед закладів такого типу, що здійснює підготовку працівників із корекційної педагогіки (із названої спеціальності є акредитація та ліцензія).
3. Інститутом створено унікальну мережу експериментальної роботи освітніх закладів регіону, що налічує понад 300 учасників (кожна третя школа області). Такі складові мережі, як мережа шкіл здоров'я, мережа шкіл освіти за програмою «Сталий розвиток», мережа шкіл європейської освіти тощо є найпотужнішими в Україні.

4. Інститут є центром проведення понад 21 олімпіади для учнів, у яких бере участь щороку 3000 осіб та численних конкурсів для учнів та педагогів, у яких бере участь понад 50 тис. учасників щороку.

5. В інституті створено ефективну систему дистанційного навчання на базі спеціалізованої кафедри інформаційних технологій. На сьогодні вона включає у себе більше 10 спеціалізованих проєктів електронного навчання з використанням кейс-технологій та можливостей Інтернету та баз для мереж професійного спілкування педагогів (освітянських онлайн співтовариств). Унікальною для України є система дистанційного підвищення кваліфікації для директорів шкіл та їх заступників на основі розробки та захисту проєктів розвитку освітніх закладів.

6. Інститут є регіональним центром підручникотворення для забезпечення методичних потреб та потреб регіонального компонента освіти, особливо українознавства. Серед здобутків його фахівців – одна з найкращих в Україні серія підручників з історії рідного краю з 7 по 11 класи, хрестоматія «Українські письменники ХХ ст.», підручники з рідної мови тощо. Одним з перших інститут розпочав підготовку електронних посібників та підручників регіонального рівня, на сьогодні їх випущено більше 15.

7. Інститут, один з небагатьох післядипломних закладів, що вийшов на рівень стандартів звичайних вишів за якістю професорсько-викладацького складу: з 60 викладачів – 5 докторів наук та 37 кандидатів наук (70%).

8. В інституті створено третю в Україні (після Києва та Харкова) наукову школу філософії освіти (3 доктори наук та 10 кандидатів наук за спеціальністю). Ця школа стала основою для наукової роботи педагогів зі шкіл, у інституті працює близько 30 здобувачів наукових ступенів.

9. Інститут є центром української культури, оскільки, на відміну від інших вишів Дніпропетровщини, освітній процес і все його методичне забезпечення тут повністю здійснюється українською мовою. Ліквідація інституту – це по суті знищення основного осередку національного мовно-культурного впливу на освітню систему в регіоні.

10. Як провідний інноваційний заклад післядипломної педагогічної освіти інститут упродовж останніх 10 років щороку визнається МОН України та НАПН України лідером сучасної освіти.

Завершуючи аналіз методологічних проблем забезпечення розвитку вітчизняної післядипломної педагогічної освіти у контексті становлення нової української школи, слід підкреслити, що їх постановка і вирішення цілком залежать від загальної моделі розвитку освіти і країни. Тому сама розробка вказаної методології є складовою частиною реалізації інноваційних концептуальних засад нової української школи і вимагає значної аналітичної роботи щодо їх адаптації в сфері післядипломної освіти.

THE ECOLOGY OF PEDAGOGICAL SPACE IN THE FRAMEWORK OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM ЕКОЛОГІЯ ПЕДАГОГІЧНОГО ПРОСТОРУ У РАМКАХ ОСВІТНЬОЇ РЕФОРМИ

P. Lushyn

The setting of the problem. The first step that any educational system makes is that it not only declares but actually tries to prove its advantage in covering some deficit or shortcoming in the development, education or upbringing of children. But any such attempt results in a similar outcome—a new model for covering the deficit emerges, which either does it better than the

previous one or proves it obsolete. Having realized this trivial fact, not only the researcher but any other subject in the educational process can be inspired with the idea that it is useless to change one's own pedagogical dispositions.

Here we encounter another fact. The general psychological theory of personal transformation emphasizes at least two transitional processes:



1) the process of personal development as intra-system or interlevel transition to a relatively new personal potential within the existing one; and 2) the process of personal transformation as intersystem transition to a new potential, which, per se, means the change of the existing system.

Thus, from the point of view of the second process--which is, by the way, inseparably linked with the first one--there is no use making arbitrary attempts to transform any system, the educational included. The transformation of a system is not an arbitrary process; or rather it appears to be such only in terms of adaptation to much larger systemic changes- the collapse of the stable democratic system after the events of September 11, 2001, the globalization processes, the war in the West of Ukraine. This very argument justifies a «sound skepticism» toward any attempts to «turn» the existing educational system «around,» or even to introduce innovations. This sound skepticism or, in psychological terms-resistance--or, in my terms, recognition of a «transitional/buffer zone,» has much greater potential than the perfection of the obsolete system. It implies a new perspective connected with the construction of a completely new potential for the development of all subsystems, the educational included [4].

The situation of the transitional or buffer zone becomes recognizable when the pioneers of pedagogical reform can no longer declare themselves to be discoverers: the new potential appears not so much on the individual as on the social level. In this case, the subject of pedagogical transformation is a kind of a «hostage» to pedagogical pressure, and his/her historic role is limited to accentuating its phenomena and adapting to them. In ecopsychological terms, it may be connected with the situation when the environment for pedagogical creativity becomes really tough, so resistant that pedagogical creativity turns into pedagogical survival. In this extremely complicated and unusual process neither teachers nor students and their parents or researchers can claim to be significant authorities--none of them have any idea about either how to live in this situation or even for what to prepare the growing generation. At the same time, each interested part entering this transitional zone comes increasingly to recognize a mutual and even fatal interest in each other: we can survive only together. Resistant agents or subjects are more important in this process than those whose roles have already been recognized in the pedagogical process. Admitting or finding the place for «renegades» we not so much hinder the transition of the whole system as we contribute to its quicker self-organization. Standing up for the purity of one's convictions every participant of the pedagogical survival must likewise persistently stick to the ecology of one's own social environment without violating its principles, laws and regularities.

How to leave the educational system open. The ideal modern educational system is typically considered to be one which realizes its goals and objectives in at least the following dimensions: a) the transmission of culturally accumulated and socially approved knowledge, b) the development of the student's personality, i.e. empowerment in a variety of certain capacities like self-regulation, thinking skills, emotional intelligence and ability to make good moral judgments, etc.; c) accomplishing a) and b) in a manner, which is not psychologically or physically overburdening either for students or for teachers and parents, and finally; d) all of these educational emergents must be in coherent interaction with the student's immediate and long-term goals, experiences and challenges--i.e. be understood as practical. It is assumed that all these dimensions of the educational system are meant to prepare the

younger generation for active and conscientious participation in constant social reconstruction.

One need not be especially competent in the sphere of education to conclude that it is impossible to put the above-mentioned system into practice. What hinders it? The first, so-called formal explanation is that ideals are always inaccessible; they are meant to motivate, to move forward. The second reason is that as soon as we define an ideal model and begin to consider the ways of its implementation, it already needs to be reconstructed, given the fact of the continuous development of any society and of its various elements. Besides, in order to create such a model, one needs to know the locus or at least the tendencies of the global structure of social development, and given the present unstable geopolitical situation, this task increases immensely in size and becomes actually impossible.

Does this mean that any educational system is doomed to obsolescence? Or can an educational system correspond to the tempo and dynamics of the development of society--or should it be ahead of it? And what about the relationship between school and life? If we judge the matter not by result--the granting of a diploma of some kind--but by process, there are always contradictions or resistances between these two components of social development. When it is school that is ahead of life, children are offered knowledge and skills which may not be used in their everyday life but are very likely to be used in the future. Conversely, school can leave life behind. Then, in their out-of-school communication children acquire knowledge and skills which, by definition, go beyond their school curricula but are extremely practical for the actualization of their future development. Obviously the most satisfying arrangement for both sides is the synchronization of both systems--society and school. In this case, resistances between them should first appear, then disappear.

Thus, in order to control the pedagogical system one should: a) preserve the content and sequence of existing school subjects and objectives; b) at the same time, realize their limited nature and give children the opportunity to gain out-of-school experience; c) follow the emerging transitional forms and phenomena that are the result of this interaction and which are presented in the opposition between school and life [2-3]. Basing the construction of new pedagogical actions and their resulting systemic developments on these principles promises to allow improvement of the existing system before it becomes stagnant or chaotic and calls for fundamental reconstruction. This presupposes distinguishing between at least two types of school disciplines: the traditional ones that allow for the investigation of special spheres-e.g. the physical sciences-and «buffer» disciplines that allow for the investigation of the situations which create personal and social uncertainty, and fill in the gaps in the educational system as it faces the problems of out-of-school life. The latter include the following tasks: a) scanning the transitional space between school and «out-of-school», b) analysing the problems that students, their parents and their teachers encounter in school reality, and c) constructing new possibilities for personal, professional and social development.

This presents us with a logical question: might these buffer disciplines have an opposite effect, and in fact weaken the «immune system» of both school and society? On this argument, children will be «deprived» of real problems because the school system «immunizes» them in advance, anticipating transitional phenomena. Isn't it wiser to leave the transitional zone between school and out-of-school belonging to no one, and leave children to learn to solve the problems of the «real world» through actualizing their



own deeply hidden resources? This question might be answered in the following way: in periods of excessive stability of the developmental processes on all educational levels, a function of uncertainty, ambiguity and contradiction might in fact act propedeutically to activate the system and to prevent its stagnation.

Again we fall into a logical trap: if we provide the resistance for them, we free our students from «natural» resistance to stagnation-i.e. we weaken their personal and cultural immune systems. The school presumes to be a substitute for life, which is impossible by definition. Moreover, this substitution may imply the idea that it is possible to remove the so-called negative situations (despair, absurdity, alienation, sufferings) from children's lives. If we could achieve this, would we not turn children's lives into a kind of «hot house» that would produce citizens who are not properly equipped for life? For in fact no matter how tragic and at the same time optimistic it might be, humanity has long since learned how to behave in extreme and profoundly challenging situations and even to benefit from them.

One might then ask: should we develop these buffer disciplines? At present the answer may be affirmative: if the idea is out there, then it is a response to some need. Such disciplines may indicate a more attentive and assiduous exploration of educational systems on the part of educators. Nevertheless, we cannot imagine a human society deprived of those imperfections that function to open any educational system to further change, development and growth per se.

«Buffer» school subjects: their meaning and forms. One of the dimensions in which pedagogy borders on psychology is in the concept of facilitation as a general capacity for a professional to initiate and guide a process of individual or communal self-organization. This assumption can be questioned from the start: Is the similarity between pedagogical and psychological facilitation so considerable that one can apply the concepts interchangeably? If the assumption is correct, then a teacher would find herself being capable of implementing therapeutic procedures while a therapist could easily teach and develop students. Since this does not seem to be true, we might refer to these professional activities as being close, as interacting in many ways but not the same.

We might be helped in our inquiry into the relation between education and psychotherapy if we examine the history of that relation in Ukrainian society over the period of the last decade. The social status of psychologists in the Ukrainian educational system, and especially in school, is very low-far lower than that of the teacher. An analogous situation can be observed in the preparation of school psychologists. In the late 1980's a movement began in the former Soviet Union designed to radically increase the amount of applied psychologists in the field of education. A decade of successful social-cultural and educational endeavor produced a paradoxical result: the rate of unemployment among school psychologists is excessively high, and there is no distinct legislative regulation of their practical activities, including norms of licensing and conducting clinical research. On the other hand many classical and pedagogical universities continue preparing psychologists of various specialties. Besides, psychological curricula are very similar to the ones of the so-called «social pedagogues» and social workers. The latter categories are at the same-if not lower-level of social demand the psychologist's.

From a western point of view this paradox can be explained by the fact that the former Ukraine is transiting from totalitarian to open market economy, and the latter is known for a well-developed social support system, including

mental as well as physical health care. Thus, according to dialectical laws, qualitative changes are about to be replaced by a shift in quantitative ones, which in the near future will most likely produce a change in the target status of a school psychologist. But at the same time an analysis of the situation in the U.S. indicates that a boom in psychotherapeutic discourses and practices has been followed by the emergence of a slightly skeptical attitude toward psychiatric and clinical help, supposedly owing to its increasingly manipulative nature: numerous psychotherapeutic procedures resemble, if not pharmacological processes, then analogously technologized ones. This is exacerbated by a change in policy among insurance companies, which have acted to reduce reimbursable contact hours with a psychologist. In addition, the extended dissemination and popularization of psychotherapeutic and psychological knowledge has added to the emergence of numerous psychotherapeutic modalities which challenge and problematize basic concepts like «mental health» and «patient,» and many pathological conditions are excluded from diagnostic inventories. Meanwhile, psychotherapeutic terminology is crossing professional boundaries and penetrating spheres like business, jurisprudence and education.

These accumulated contradictions-between, on the one hand, a growing body of psychologists ready to serve the increasing social needs of Ukrainian society and being rejected; on the other hand signs in the U.S. of exhaustion of the existing clinical paradigm accompanied by its expansion across professional boundaries-are so far being addressed by Ukrainians though avoiding the high road which has been taken by western psychology: from psychiatry to clinical psychology through social work to business and education. But it could be further resolved through the emergence of transitional or buffer disciplines in education such as learning or pedagogical facilitation. These buffer subjects are located somewhere in a marginal area between psychology and education. Their meaning is not the property of either child or adult, of psychologist or teacher. It is a zone of transition toward the mutually and socially beneficial results of communal self-organization. Within such a zone the «teaching facilitator» has the opportunity to develop her own educational potential as her students develop their own personal potential. In this zone they meet in a joint effort to transit to their individual zones of proximal development-for the buffer zone represents, in Vygotskian language, the intersection of zones of actual and proximal development. As it does not fully belong to the child, the teacher, for example, also has access to it, and thereby to the child's psyche and development. The same is true of the adult «buffer» zone, which is not «protected» from so called «kid's intrusion.» Development takes place not so much in those two or even three zones as in the overlap or crossing--the «buffer» zones of both the child and adult. It is in this «no man's land,» where they both feel drawn to each other that there is possible the emergence of an authentic mutually beneficial co-operation, resulting in cooperative social development. Thus the buffer subjects are meant for authentic cooperative facilitation, which can presuppose neither imposition, nor any form of manipulative learning or teaching in the classic sense of the word. This learning facilitation turns into co-construction of communal meaning in a situation of personal and social transition and ambiguity.

This definition is very close to the one I attribute to a relatively new and innovative school subject called «Philosophy for children» (P4C) which, since its appearance in the 1970's, has been disseminated throughout the world, most especially in the countries with transitional economies and developing



democracies like Brazil, Poland, Russia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria [1]. Characteristically for a buffer discipline, P4C curricula are designed not only for professional philosophers but ordinary teacher and educators as well as psychologists and even administrators. The curriculum consists of a series of philosophical novels combined with a methodology for teaching them called «community of inquiry» (CI), a pedagogy based on communal dialogue, whose aim is not so much to transmit certain philosophical knowledge as to develop the basics of creative and critical thinking. CI pedagogy aims for the students not so much to discover the author's meaning as to use the text as a cultural tool whereby they project their own personal meanings (triggered by the text) into the sphere of communal dialogue and consequence reconstruction of a new collective generalized meaning. The role of the philosopher in CI is atypical compared to the role of the traditional teacher.

One of the basic skills to be assimilated in the dynamic of CI is the posing of questions meant for developing a discussion agenda. The questions generated by the students may not coincide directly with the contents of the philosophical text. Often the questions serve as a means to involve students in a process of group dialogue. The text is created in such a way that (a) the facilitator is able avoid any form of imposition or manipulation, (b) it targets a certain age group and (c) its design enables participants to start a discussion in an open-ended and often even ambiguous way.

P4C proponents tend to insist that the facilitator should not concentrate on achieving psychotherapeutic effects. Facilitation must be associated with certain social emergents like the ability to listen, to respect the other, and to formulate arguments in distinct socially accepted terms. Most important to practitioners is not problem-solving or even building a sense of consolidated group identity capable of doing so; rather it is in promoting a self-organizing unity in continuous reconstruction of personal and social meaning. It is in this sense that Philosophy for Children is transitional, and not because it is controversial and ephemeral in its essence. In a changing world like ours, it represents the sphere of chaos defibrillated into the order of rhythmic constructive activity.

I would like to examine the term «defibrillation» in more detail, especially in the context of facilitation and help. As I mentioned above there is a strong correlation between different forms of facilitation/help: pedagogical, psychological and, I would now add, philosophical. I do not think it would be inconsistent to assume that the concept of help could be defined as (a) isolating oneself or another person from something which is alien and disturbing, (b) fighting against it, and finally (c) communicating with it in order to desensitize or compensate its destructive or negative influence. If all of these three aspects are connected in a temporal sequence, it yields an understanding of help, which is analogous to the functioning of the immune system. In order to survive, the immune system first isolates the organism from, say, a virus, then it fights it, producing anti-bodies. The latter are the result of communication between genes and anti-genes. As soon as the anti-bodies are ready, the system becomes indifferent to the virus, which in fact could be construed as the organism developing a tolerance to the primary form of the virus. From a dialectical perspective, the organism has become different from the one it was in the beginning. The same transformation could be expected from the virus [3].

Back to defibrillation: the virus is the fibrillator for the organism and its immune system, and the same could be said about the organism from

the perspective of the virus. They both save each other through a variety of interactions. Then, defibrillation means sustaining the interaction. But how? When the immune system is stagnating in comfort, i.e. is in a stage which is antithetical to movement and development, it needs disturbing agents. It does not mean that the conflicting agents are necessarily evil--they are simply different. If they are very different and even antagonistic, the interaction will trigger metamorphosis, disorganization, chaos, and new forms of order.

We used to think that in order to make a difference a psychological facilitator needed integrative (problem solving) skills, a philosophical facilitator critical skills, and the pedagogue caring skills. But the buffer disciplines demand all three, and the facilitator is no long the expert manipulating these skills, for these disciplines represents dialogical rather than instrumental or transmissional situations, and all of them develop through communal dialogue, understanding and care. In the buffer zone there are no authorities, but there is the possibility of building a richer and fuller life collaboratively, and of developing new forms of facilitation and help. This new paradigm of facilitation is an ecological one, and as such its primary rhetorical form is not the proposition, the diagnosis or even the task, but the question.

On the meaning of questioning in the community of inquiry. It is assumed that a Philosophy for Children teacher typically starts the group process by encouraging students to put questions to a narrative which contains meaningful, philosophically charged material [1]. Usually this procedure takes an extended period of time--often up to it 2/3 of a class period. Why--judging from the time and effort spent--this procedure? I offer the following analysis:

It represents an opposing viewpoint to the existing educational paradigm, in which it is the teacher who raises questions and sets tasks for the students to perform. P4C methodology presupposes that the teacher not do this. If the student is a subject of the group process along with the teacher, then she should be more active than in just answering the latter's questions.

Students are encouraged not to be self-centered, but to learn to identify their questions with social problems. Participants are taught to correlate their own questions with the those of others in the group. In this case, the discussion assumes a social dimension and turns into a joint inquiry, which fosters social awareness among individuals.

In order for a problematic text to be accepted as transformative, participants need to project themselves into it. The question can be defined as a means of crossing motivational boundaries for the sake of constructing a shared space for generating new meanings.

If such a considerable amount of time is given to problematization, it is for the purpose of uncovering various perspective or alternative ways of viewing the object or phenomenon. The student may also thereby develop the idea that any point of view can be accepted as adequate--the main condition is to specify the context. On this account, the formation of the capacity for divergent thinking and of an assertive attitude to life is of major importance.

Cognitive psychologists stress the fact that the precise formulation of a question either promotes the resolution of the problem it represents, or in fact is its resolution.

On the other hand, the phenomenon of problematization in CI can be viewed from a different, less affirmative perspective:

Given that its learning process as an exteriorized form of thinking, it is not just a transmission of the «material,» but neither does it necessarily form students' capacities to put questions in any meaningful way. It is more a form of reconstruction--by which we mean generating new meanings through



various forms of group process. In such a classroom, social values are challenged and reconstructed. Students are often more open, not so overloaded with social responsibilities, more imaginative and, by definition, more motivated to change than adults. If this function of CI is the major one, then in any given class, each participant may undergo an experience of being, not just a problematizer, but a constructor of meanings. This constructive function of education places the teacher and the child in one and the same learning dimension and makes of them co-workers--not because of their space-time unity but because of their mutually constructive disposition. The radical problematization which an overemphasis on questioning implies can interfere with this constructive function.

As soon as a community of inquiry undertakes the formation of a philosophical life-attitude in which critical thinking plays a major part, then its structure must be made up of three major elements: problematization, hypothesis-formation and testing, and self-correction or/and evaluation. The overestimation of the first component of the learning process may lead to a deformation of the process as a whole.

Another argument against the overestimation of the problematizing component of CI comes from the assumption that if the teacher is not distributing the questioning process among the students, then their capacity to do so is blocked. This assumption could be questioned, for the school is not the only place in which questioning skills are developed. A life situation may be no less of a teacher for a child than a formal educational context or event. The problem of not being able to ask questions could be interpreted as, say, (a) the student is not motivated to cooperate or (b) the tasks are too easily accomplished, or (c) the teacher is not genuinely interested in listening to the child.

Research based on the educational paradigm developed by psychologists – among whom are V. Davidov, S. Maksimenko, I. Bekh, V. Repkin – indicates that, no matter how interesting and problematic the learning material may be from the teacher's point of view, this doesn't guarantee genuine participation in group inquiry into that material. That the student may have learned to put questions does not necessarily imply that this skill contributes to his growth in thinking skills or personal development.

The only view which might eliminate these negative arguments comes from the idea that the formation of the ability to put questions is in itself a model of the learning group process. The construction of questions implies the next two phases of the process-hypothesis-generation and self-correction. The putting of questions is therefore a central aspect of the mutually constructive learning dimension of teacher and student mentioned above. We may even go so far as to suggest that the questioning itself is the construction: as soon as the child has mastered the construction of questions, there may not be a special need to teach him to construct ways to resolve and evaluate the problems as they are. From a dialectical perspective, deconstruction announces reconstruction. The only mediating factor is time.

Ecological group facilitation: the basic skills. Before undertaking to lead a group the facilitator asks herself a question: can the group lead itself? If it cannot, then her task is to admit that the group is not just in a state of rest resulting from the style of former leadership, but is in a state more like stagnation. Its participants need either to determine a topic that will bring about a new cycle of constructive activity, or to construct something that will «immunize» or «vaccinate» them against stagnation, i.e. will provoke new

group and individual self-organization. In the first case, the facilitator moves to create conditions for the group to treat themselves more ecologically, e.g. not to fear someone else's judgment. In this situation everybody has a chance to declare his or her interests without the fear of being rejected. As a result, the exchange of priorities and goals may serve as a basis for the construction of a shared goal.

Hence, the conditions for stagnation may be an unfavorable microclimate or, in other words, a rejection of equal interaction by the participants. Therefore, at this first stage of group dynamics the facilitator creates a favorable microclimate, and in second stage- «vaccination» against stagnation-she provokes the group by introducing some form of vaccination that will cause an «immune reaction.» One way to do this is to touch on some «weak,» or «delicate» or overvalued beliefs or opinions dear to every group participant. Even an «unusual interpretation of the usual» may serve as a kind of provocation. In the first stage, building relations of equal favorable interaction itself serves as self-provocation, because it means that everyone can express his or her opinion-at least one of which will inevitably conflict with someone else's. In the second stage, when the level of mutual trust within the group is higher than the trust in an outside person, the facilitator seeks to find the topic or theme that will «break» the existing pattern of understanding/interpretation of group events and thereby cause the conditions for construction of a new one.

As a new topic is being located, the facilitator is very attentive to each member's position, and to his or her style of communicating them. He listens to every remark and also remains attentive to nonverbal expressions. This is the basic skill of active listening applied to the content of the group discussion. When the participant finishes his or her proposition or argument, the facilitator asks himself if it was clear to everybody; if not, he paraphrases it in the speaker's terms, then gives the speaker the opportunity to correct his interpretation. If this, in turn, fails, the facilitator appeals to the group to help clarify the idea. This kind of behavior is a prime example working according to principles of group ecology and building a primary level of group acceptance and mutual responsibility.

As participants offer their positions, the facilitator performs a dual movement of structuring and also following the direction and pattern of claims, arguments and examples, seeking every opportunity to identify and feed back the larger patterns of argument which suggest themselves in the process of dialogue. This skill is particularly useful in moments of «stagnation,» when the claims and reasons and examples are in an entropic state-i.e. when they have proliferated and drifted apart to the point where the implicit structure which they form is no longer or hardly visible. Another facilitation skill is that of provocation, critique, or challenge, which often emerges when one points to a contradiction within the logic of a member's argument. Again, if the facilitator fails in articulating the contradiction, the task can be shared with other participants. Other forms of challenge/critique consist in mirroring the stagnation-state of the group, or giving the floor to those who tend to perform the function of critic or skeptic within the group.

If a confrontation of opinions occur, the major factor that will «push» or organise the group process is close attention to the opponents' positions. Thereby, the possibility of activating or projecting hidden resources of group dynamics increases. As the group self-disorganises by expressing diverse opinions, the process may become chaotic. At the same time, if the topic is significant and the process has gone its usual way, there may spontaneously



appear the participants who will «localise» or «pacify» the group process trying to not only maintain good discipline but also to co-ordinate opinions. This symbolises a new stage of discussion dynamics.

On the assumption that at every stage of group dynamics the facilitator induces or suggests something to the participants, the first stage is characterised by the ability to take an observing position, which requires an ecological or tolerant attitude to every participant in the group. The model of this ability is the facilitator herself, who does her best not to get detached from the discussion while providing the opportunity for others to follow as closely as she is. And at a certain point the facilitator even restrains herself from leading the group in order to give the group the opportunity to self-organize even as the participants seem to have lost this ability—and this in itself is, of course, a form of leadership.

The facilitator is motivated by the conviction that the group must find the solution or answer to the question it has posed itself. And that answer must satisfy the facilitator as well as a participant of the group. If it does not—if she is neglected—the second crucial stage of facilitation follows, in which she does not restrain herself from expressing her discontent, and attempts to «correct» the development of the group towards her own understanding

REFERENCES

1. Lipman, M., and Sharp, A. *Growing up with Philosophy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1978. – 220 p.
2. Lushyn, P. *The Problem of Pedagogical Transfer of Critical Thinking Curriculum within Global and Ecopsychological Perspectives // Children Philo-sophize Worldwide: Theoretical and Practical Concepts*. – Eds. Eva Marshal / Takara Dobashi / Barabar Weber. – Berlin : Peter Lang. – 2009. – P. 179–184. 0,5 друк. арк.
3. Лушин П. В. Хаос и неопределенность: от страдания – к росту и развитию

of the issue. This, again, is her right as a group participant rather than as the «authority.» This stage is a risky one, for it may influence the group which does not recognize that the move is a democratic one, but takes it as an assertion of authority, to either accept her arguments submissively or to resist non-verbally, if not otherwise, the «authority» they understand her to be asserting. Its ambiguity is amplified by the fact that the moment of her assertion is closely connected with the moment of her rejection, at which point the facilitator takes the «underdog» position, and defends her right to acknowledge her own experience and competence. Unfortunately, some facilitators overlook or shy away from this circumstance. In fact it is absolutely logical, given the fact that the facilitator went through the first stage together with the group, and her original position prepares her for access to the second.

Having reached some kind of consensus--i.e. the at least temporary satisfaction of all perspectives--the ecology of the situation must be «tested,» i.e. it is necessary to answer the question of how fully each position has been integrated. In this context, an ecological evaluation implies the ability to include identify aspects or elements of the theme under discussion that may have been ignored, rejected or overlooked. These aspects often provide the material for the group's progress over subsequent sessions.

[Текст] : Монографія / Лушин П. В. – Киев, 2017. – 144 с. – (Серія «Живая книга»; Т. 4).

4. Концепція Нової української школи : Електронний ресурс – Режим доступу <https://www.kmu.gov.ua/storage/app/media/reforms/ukrainska-shkola-compressed.pdf> . – Мова : укр. – Дата останнього доступу : 01.03.2017. – Загол. з екрану.

РОЗВИТОК МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ ВЧИТЕЛЯ В СИСТЕМІ ПІСЛЯДИПЛОМНОЇ ОСВІТИ

О. Лаврентьєва

У сучасній соціокультурній ситуації професійна підготовка вчителя має забезпечувати, окрім спеціальної фахової, загальноосвітню, культурологічну й світоглядну підготовку, соціальний розвиток і професійне становлення у вибраній сфері педагогічної діяльності. Підготовка вчителя розглядається як комплексна програма, в основі якої — програмно-цільовий метод планування й наукового управління його професійним саморозвитком. Провідною метою, підґрунтям та умовою її ефективності є розвиток особистості педагога, оволодіння ним відповідними знаннями та здібностями. Обсяг і напрям цього процесу мають відповідати вимогам глобалізації, інформатизації й полікультурності сучасного суспільства (О. Абдулліна, С. Архангельський, В. Биков, В. Бондар, Є. Бондаревська, С. Гончаренко, Н. Гузій, І. Зязюн, В. Кремень, В. Кузь, Н. Кузьміна, З. Курлянд, О. Лаврінченко, В. Луговий, О. Мороз, Н. Нічкало, В. Орлов, Л. Пуховська, В. Радул, О. Савченко, С. Сисосва, В. Сластьонін, Л. Хомич, В. Шахов та ін.). Помітна роль у цій справі належить післядипломній освіті, зміст якої і дотепер є предметом дискусій та наукових пошуків.

Провідні вчені, які спеціально займаються вдосконаленням змісту професійної освіти (В. Андрєєв, О. Барабанщиков, В. Беспалько, В. Бенін, Є. Бондаревська, О. Гребенюк, В. Гриньова, О. Дубасенюк, В. Загвазинський, О. Кобенюк, І. Колесникова, А. Кузьмінський, О. Матвієнко,

О. Огієнко, В. Рибалка, Л. Сергєєва та ін.), небезпідставно вважають, що в сучасних умовах сформований образ професійно-педагогічної культури вже не забезпечує професійного й кар'єрного успіху вчителя, його конкурентоспроможність, високий рівень професіоналізму та педагогічної майстерності. Ці проблеми стали закономірним відображенням суперечностей між справжнім ідеалом учителя й недостатньо дієвими механізмами й якістю його професійної підготовки, реальним станом культурного розвитку й сформованою системою професійних цінностей. Як результат, переосмислення змісту професійної діяльності вчителя, який сьогодні виходить на рівень проектування й конструювання педагогічних систем, виокремлюється в новий культурний феномен – методологічна культура вчителя (О. Бережнова, С. Гончаренко, В. Кравцов, В. Кушнір, П. Кабанов, В. Краєвський, В. Сластьонін, О. Ходусов та ін.). Значущість методологічної культури саме для вчителя, на відміну від ученого, дослідника чи професійного методолога, полягає в тому, що кваліфіковане виконання ним своїх функцій передбачає цілеспрямоване й професійне дослідження на основі осмислених, привласнених і дієвих ціннісних орієнтацій сучасного постіндустріального суспільства.

З метою визначення актуальності питання розвитку методологічної культури вчителя, змісту і сутності його методологічної підготовки ми