The Theory of Attraction and the Principles of Facilitative Interaction

Теорія потягу і принципи фасилітативної взаємодії

Khupavtseva Nataliia

Dr. in Psychology, Assistant Professor,
Rivne State University of the Humanities, Rivne (Ukraine)
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8883-7686
Web of Science ResearcherID: AAC-2156-2019
Scopus AuthorID: 57221383831
E-mail: natalahupavceva@gmail.com

Хупавцева Наталія

Доктор психологічних наук, доцент,
Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет, Рівне (Україна)

Kurytsia Denys

Ph.D. in Psychology, Senior Lecturer,
Kamianets-Podilskyi National Ivan Ohiienko University,
Kamianets-Podilskyi (Ukraine)
ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-1192-1003
E-mail: deniskouritsa@gmail.com

Куриця Денис

Кандидат психологічних наук, старший викладач,
Кам'янець-Подільський національний університет
імені Івана Огієнка,
м. Кам'янець-Подільський (Україна)

The contribution of the author: Khupavtseva Nataliia – 50%, Kurytsia Denys – 50%

Авторський внесок: Хупавцева Наталія – 50%, Куриця Денис – 50%

ABSTRACT

The purpose of our research is: using the main statements of the theory of attraction to formulate the principles of facilitative interaction; to propose a set of exercises for the development of facilitative interaction of pupils at the lessons; to propose four types of transformation utterances of facilitative interaction at the lessons.

Methods of the research. The following theoretical methods of the research were used to solve the tasks formulated in the article: the categorical method, structural and functional methods, the methods of the analysis, systematization, modeling, generalization.

The results of the research. We proved, that the socio-genetic mechanism of facilitation is the mechanism of cultural transmission: to facilitate means to stimulate, to activate, to create favorable conditions, to make changes and to influence, to support, to help, to care, etc.; a belief in the original, constructive and creative essence of a man as self-worth. The result of facilitation is the concept of necessary and sufficient conditions for effective interpersonal communication that promote the development of personality and to provide constructive personality changes.

The procedural side of facilitation at the lessons of secondary school is implied on the principles of synergy – cooperation, interaction, a dialogue; truthfulness and openness; the acceptance of another person as personally significant one; empathic understanding; the formation of skills and abilities which are appropriate for facilitative interaction.

Conclusions. It was noted that the facilitative aspects of students' autonomy often impressed with their results: pupils realized and accepted the need to organize activities in the environment of interpersonal communication as personally significant ones, contributing to their own personal development and providing constructive personal change. Students seek to develop skills of empathic mastery of the context; students are interested in creating positive preconditions for the formation of meaningful learning and personal development in general as a result of the restructuring of personal views in the process of interpersonal interaction; students are aware of their self-sufficiency. Facilitative aspects of human autonomy are actualized through four main methods of

interpersonal interaction: persuasion, imitation, suggestion and infection, which are facilitative by their context.

It is proved, that persuasion is the process of substantiating judgments or inferences. The imitation is the reproduction of certain external features of the behavior, the actions and the activities by a person. Suggestion is considered to be the psychological influence of one person on another; this process is designed for uncritical perception of words, thoughts and desires expressed by different people. Infection is the process of transmitting an emotional state from one person to another, actualizing the semantic effect of perception in the process of interpersonal interaction. It was noted that when all these methods of interpersonal interaction were explained in the process of the activity, the product of this activity, as a rule, would differ in a creative, non-standard approach and, that is the most important, – all students always like these products.

Key words: facilitation, facilitative interaction, the theory of attraction, the principles of facilitative interaction, the development of individual learning route, creating positive conditions for interaction, creation of positive preconditions for learning and personal development of students.

Introduction

According to the etymology of the term "facilitation" (from English *to facilitate* – positive impact, facilitation), facilitative interaction has the aim for significantly improving individual results of cognitive activity through the presence of another person – such empirical data were found by E. Stone in N. Triplet's research. In such a way, N. Triplet drew attention to the fact that cyclists got much better results when competing with an opponent than during competitions for one or more hours. The scientist decided to conduct an experiment and protested against athletes in the distance of 25 miles in both types of races, and then compared the results. Participants in the one-mile race showed an average of five times higher results than fixed-term competitors. The research of N. Triplet (1898) was the first experimental study in the field of Social Psychology. He called this phenomenon a "dynamitogenic factor" in determining the athlete-leader in the race. Today we call this phenomenon *facilitation* (Стоун, 1984).

According to E. Stone, the effect of facilitation was also revealed in the experiments that took place after the research conducted by N. Triplet (Стоун, 1984). Thus, C. Rogers noted that every time he entered the laboratory, his students significantly improved the performance of the finger ergograph compared to the results of working alone, without the presence of others. Similar data were found during verbal or simple psychomotor tasks (Rogers, 1983). In this context, the term "facilitation" was firstly used by G. Allport, who used the following interpretation: facilitation is a change in human behavior as a result of the presence of other people who perform the same activities at the same time but independently (Оллпорт, 1998).

Golf lessons, during which each athlete practices a certain stroke, are the example of joint action, which is characterized by a certain facilitative effect. This situation is significantly different from the situation of interpersonal interaction, which requires clear coordination in the actions of participants who solve some common problem. Understanding facilitation in the narrow sense, however, we'll explain only one side of other people's influence on subjects' performance of certain cognitive tasks and objectives. Some rather early studies have even shown a significant deterioration in the activity of micro-group partners or some inhibitory effect. For example, the presence of several people disturbed the respondents and significantly prevented them from memorizing "meaningless" syllables and thus passing through the labyrinth of the palace (Zajonc & Sales, 1996). Other researchers did not find any difference at all between the performance of respondents who work alone and in the presence of other people.

Subsequent experiments have also shown that in the presence of other people it was increased the speed of the task, when, for example, a person performed simple examples of multiplication and deleted the given letters in the text. In addition, the accuracy of performing simple motor tasks, such as hitting a metal rod in a circle in the size of a ten-cent coin, which is on a permanently moving gramophone disk (Zajonc & Sales, 1996).

Further researches of the facilitation effect are described in detail in the research of R. Zajonc & S. Sales, who made some authorial additions to this concept, describing it as strengthening of certain dominant reactions, activation of actions, joint activities in the presence of others. Thus, R. Zajonc & S. Sales were interested in how to reconcile results that had significant contradictions in their content. Scientists have used the well-known principle of Experimental Psychology that always enhanced the dominant reaction of the individual (Zajonc & Sales, 1996).

As a rule, increased arousal improves a person's performance of simple tasks, for which the most likely ("dominant") reaction is the correct solution of the problem from a subjective point of view. People are quicker to solve simple anagrams, crossword puzzles when they are excited. In complex problems, where the correct answer is difficult to find, excitement often causes an inadequate response. Excited people are usually less likely to solve complex problems (Onufriieva & Ivashkevych, 2021).

If social arousal enhances the dominant personality response, it must improve the performance of simple tasks related to food, in particular – the latter are considered by scientists as quite simple tasks for which the dominant response is acquired or even innate. It is only natural that the presence of other people in such tasks is greatly improved (Гончарук & Онуфрієва, 2018).

On the other hand, mastering new material, going through a maze and solving complex math problems are more difficult tasks for which it is not easy to find the right answer from the very beginning (Crookes, 1989). In the presence of other people the number of incorrect answers to solve such problems increases over many times. In this sense, a general rule is dominant – arousal contributes to the dominant reaction in both cases. Thus, results that seem contradictory at the first glance appear to be in good agreement (Терновик & Сімко, 2020).

Thus, after almost 300 experiments conducted with more than 25,000 volunteer participants, the hypothesis formulated by R. Zajonc & S. Sales from the beginning was confirmed. Seve-

ral experiments in which R. Zajonc & S. Sales and their assistants elicited a spontaneous dominant reaction in respondents also suggested that this reaction was indeed intensifying in public. In one of these experiments, R. Zajonc & S. Sales asked respondents to say each word from a certain set of words from 1 to 16 times. The researchers then explained that the words would take turns appearing on the screen for one-hundredth of a second, exposing only chaotic black lines, and that respondents "saw" mostly the words they used to say more often. These words became the conductor of the dominant reaction. People who performed the same task in the presence of two other respondents guessed the dominant words much more often. Thus, R. Zajonc & S. Sales's original interpretation of the traditional concept of "facilitation" is based on the theory of attraction and personal attractiveness. The scientist noted that the interpretation of existing data in the scientific literature will not contradict the truth, if we distinguish between the actualization of the facilitative effect in learning and performing cognitive activities (Zajonc & Sales, 1996).

Thus, if the respondent performs simple tasks that require little effort to solve the problems, then the presence of others greatly improves the results, while if the respondent performs a complex task or a solution that requires a high level of knowledge, skills and abilities, the presence of outsiders significantly impairs the performance of this task or another one (Mykhalchuk & Onufriieva, 2020).

So-called "theory of attraction" has established that with increasing arousal there is a tendency to realize the dominant (most likely) reaction or action. In other words, if a person is excited and has a stimulus that causes several potential reactions, the most likely is the reaction, which in this case is the strongest among these. Experimental researches in the paradigm of the theory of attraction also show that in the process of learning the dominant reaction is often the performance of erroneous actions or tasks.

Thus, R. Zajonc and S. Sales (Zajonc & Sales, 1996) experimentally proved that the presence of other people greatly enhances facilitative arousal. This most important point in his author's theory allows us to conclude that the simple presence of strangers significantly impairs learning, because in this case the excitement increases significantly, and the person usually reacts inadequately, but such presence of others greatly facilitates good performance, mastered tasks or problems, because under these conditions a person often performs right actions.

Thus, R. Zajonc and S. Sales (Zajonc & Sales, 1996) research has been interested many scientists and encouraged them to study this problem again. Using human influences and verbal tasks, many researchers have experimentally confirmed the idea of scientists (Івашкевич & Комарніцька, 2020) that the presence of strangers has the same effect when respondents acquire skills and perform different types of cognitive activities. Scientists have emphasized that a distinction should be made between simple and complex motor skills of learning and performing actions. In addition, testing the hypothesis of R. Zajonc & S. Sales should really confirm whether the presence of strangers really increases the level of excitement. Given the theory of attraction, which was the basis of the new formulation of R. Zajonc & S. Sales, we can note that a complex task on motility in contrast to the simple problems causes quite a number of opposite reactions. This means that if at least one or more movements are correct, there are other incorrect movements. The complexity of a particular task depends, as a rule, on the difficulty of mastering the individual's tangential movement in relation to another, dominant reaction (Zajonc & Sales, 1996).

So, **the purpose** of our research is: using the main statements of the theory of attraction to formulate the principles of facilitative interaction; to propose a set of exercises for the development of facilitative interaction of pupils at the lessons; to propose four types of transformation utterances of facilitative interaction at the lessons.

Before looking at the description of facilitative interaction at the English lessons it is necessary to focus on the analysis of dialogical communication in general and the functional completeness of some particular replicas in particular.

Observation of dialogical communication in real conditions shows that different replicas of dialogue (or its segment) perform different functions. It is necessary to distinguish between replicas that perform the actual, emotional-reactive, contact-setting and techno-communicative functions.

The first group of replicas includes statements in which something is reported, ascertain, for example: *John has fallen seriously ill. Tomorrow we'll have Geography instead of Physics.*

The second type includes replicas of emotional reactive expression that occurs during direct contact, but excludes replica-condemnation. To the replica of emotional-reactive expression can be attributed:

a) expressions that convey positive emotions: *Yes; Yes, of course; Certainly; That's it; Just so; Exactly so; Naturally;*

b) expressions that convey negative emotions (irritation, doubt): *Impossible! Why should I …? Nothing of the kind! By no means! It's unjust! Nonsence!*

c) expressions of doubt: *Probably; Maybe; Most probably; I doubt it; Really? Are you sure? Too good to be true! Is that so?*

d) expressions of wonder: *Is that so? Impossible! Oh! Indeed? You don't say so! Dear me! How surprising! Who'd have thought it? Goodness gracious! You don't mean it, do you?*

We can merge the replicas of the contact-setting destination with:

a) formulas of courtesy and greetings: *Please; I'm sorry; Excuse me; I beg your pardon; Not at all; Don't mention it; That's all right; Thank you; Many thanks; Hello! Good morning! Good-bye!*

b) dating form: *May I introduce myself; My name is…; Meet my friend…; Glad to meet you! How do you do?*

c) expressions of the actual nature (used to maintain contact with the rules of courtesy, tradition or in the absence of informa-

tion that may interest the partner, or when they are not going to inform something informative): *Well, how are you? Good day today! Vacations? Yes, yes; Is it? Remember me to...! Give my love to...; I hope we'll see you soon; Congratulations! My best wishes to you! I wish you good luck! (A) Happy New Year! Many happy returns of the day! May all dreams come true!*

Peculiarities of the techno-communicative function are:

a) indicators of destination: *Miss Adams! Mr. Jones...*

We are talking about anthroponomy; in a dialogue they often become separate vocative replicas, for example:

S.1: Peter Hawkins! Hawkins!

S.2: Yes, sir!

S.1: Why are you making everybody look for you?

b) replication in contact and out of it: *Excuse me! Hey, porter! I say! Look here! That's all. That reminds me...Well...; Talking of...; Just a minute; Excuse my interrupting you;*

c) contact replicas with the aim of control: *I can't hear you. Can you speak slower? Pardon? Will you repeat it? I can't follow you; Speak louder! Speak more distinctly!*

d) replicas of the request for information (interrogation, clarification, etc.): *What time is it? Has Bob been to the doctor today? Is he a chemist, not a dentist? Are you really twenty-one? Tell me about ... Answer my question, please! Describe it in detail.*

Depending on the extent to which the partners of communication in a dialogue are relying on the situation of communication and circumstances, on the one hand, and how this situation will be reflected in their language activity, two types of dialogue can be distinguished: *contextual* and *situational* ones.

For the interpretation of the first type of a text, we can say that such a dialogue actually describes the situation of communication itself.

For example:

S.1: Jim is complaining of sleeplessness.

S.2: He ought to go the doctor.

S.1: He needn't. It'll be quite enough if he eats a little less before going to bed.

The second kind of a dialogue, as a rule, differs in conciseness, curvature of language characteristics, for example:

S.1: (bringing the menu). Here you are. What would you like?

S.2: Please this, this and this (showing the indication of dishes in the menu)

S.1: I'm sorry we've run out of this (crossing out the name of the dish out of the menu). Choose something else.

S.2: Then this, please.

S.1: Well, I wouldn't recommend it to you (…)

A person who does not participate in a dialogue is unclear what kind of dishes is being discussed.

A dialogical statement can be internally motivated (the participant in the dialogue speaks, guided by his/her own thoughts, such as – why he/she entered into the current linguistic contact that he/she cares about what he/she thinks) and externally motivated (the response to the replica of the partner, the answer to the question, the response to the situation, the formula of courtesy).

S.1: Hello, Mrs. Parker!

S.2: Oh, Mr. Rawlings, hello, come in.

S.1: I've called specially to ask whether it is your dog. I found it under my counter.

Last replica of S.1 was dictated by the motives behind the situation of communication. Here is another example:

S.1: We are in for a hot and dry summer again.

S.2: Well, one can never tell for sure. One season is not like the other in these parts.

Last replica of S.2 was caused by stimulating reaction of the statement of the partner of communication.

So, we proposed exercises for students, which would be analyzed in terms of the motivation indicated in the dialogical speech. In the final results' statements should be balanced.

In the complex of focused learning actions that develop the skills of dialogical communication, we should include both prepa-

ratory exercises and the exercises that develop the ability to maintain a personal dialogue in the language having been studied.

Let us look at two types of exercises for learning expressive speech which is actual in the process of facilitative interaction at the English lessons. When performing exercises of the first type (prepared, training) a specific language material was activated, that was acquired skills of operation with certain phonetic, grammatical and lexical elements. The content of these exercises or drills consists of repeated statements of a foreign language which all correspond to this content.

The exercises of the second type (speech) also activate the linguistic material, but solve more complex communicative-content and creative problems: they develop the ability to create linguistic activity for the purpose of communication, form a willingness to engage in the process of real communication. The essence of these exercises is the construction of a linguistic form for transferring of the person's own thoughts, discussions, observations etc.

Since the main functional unit of exercises of the first type is the sentence, it can be assumed that the drafts (imitation, transformational, that is, those substituting) equally contribute to learning both monologue and dialogical strategies of communication, since the sentence can be a replica in a dialogue and an integral element of the unambiguous unity. Training exercises, as well as educational dialogue, contribute significantly to the development of dialogical speech skills. In a case of exercises of the second type (which are communicative), some of them by their nature and the speech product they provide are intended primarily for the development of dialogical communication (for example, teaching-speaking situations). They primarily belong to the inclusion in a set of forms of the activity for the development of the skills of dialogical speech of students.

A set of exercises for the development of facilitative interaction at the English lessons includes three consecutive series of educational actions:

1. Aspect-training exercises for working out of the linguistic (phonetic, lexico-grammatical) material.

2. Exercises for the development of abilities to express replicas.

3. Exercises for communicative function in a dialogue.

Exercises of the first and the second series are prepared. They have an identical structure that includes the following components:

a) the instruction (indicating what to do);

b) the example or a model (illustration of how to perform the exercise);

c) the stimulus (the primary language or speech material to be processed is the point of a learning operation);

d) the reaction (the result of the pupils' educational activity).

The simplest operation for changing is the absence of any formations or so called zero change.

There are exercises for instant display of the linguistic sign (imitation, echo-repetition) and reflection of the mnemonic sphere of the person (memory reproduction).

In spite of the mechanical nature of the operation had been produced during the simulation of the language, the model is based on real conditions of communication of speech acts (repeated statements of children and adults, the repetition of the material the partner said in the connection with amazement, disrespectful listening, the need to receive, express consent or show ironic attitude to what was said, etc.). For example:

S.1: Where are my spectacles?

S.2: Here are your spectacles.

S.1: Where were you hiding them?

S.2: Hiding them?

S.1: Hiding them.

S.2: I wasn't hiding them (…)

Microdialogues (3-5 replicas) should have a dynamic plot, simple colloquial formulas, used vocabulary.

S.1: What is your hobby, Alex?

S.2: I collect books published in the 17-18th centuries.

S.1: How interesting! Have you got many of them in your collection?

S.2: Quite a lot. There are almost five hundred of them.

The most typical unit of the dialogical text for displaying exercises is the speech example, clich and conversational formulas. For example (a situation at the station):

S.1: Ah, hello, Bob, here you are! How are you? So glad to see you again!

S.2: And so am I. Awfully good of you to meet me.

S.1: That's all right … You're looking jolly well.

S.2: Yes, thanks, I'm feeling very fit. And how're you?

S.1: Well, I'm not feeling quite the thing; I've had a bit of cold the last day or two.

Let us look at the volume and the structure of a single statement in a dialogical speech. The statement may be a short one comparing with two-hour speech. From the methodological point of view it is necessary to distinguish between dialogical unity (2 replicas); micro-dialogue (3-5 replicas); middle dialogue (6-15 replicas) and macro-dialogue (more than 15 replicas, for example, a scene in a play). Thus, the phonation types of sentences *Tcc! Mм! Sch!* can be regarded as the first level of expression, that is the expressions at the level of phonemes. In *facilitative interaction at the English lessons* should be distinguished:

a) the minimum volume of the speech creation (usually – ellipses) – they are the words of such a type: *Yes, No;* separate questionnaires: *For what? Why? Where?;* elliptical structures: *We, too; They will; On the table;* concise answers: *Yes, of course; Surely; Probably yes; May be*;

b) the replica that consists of a full sentence, often with an elliptical sentence, for example:

S.1: Where are you hurrying?

S.2: To the station. I'm leaving;

ISSN 2227-6246 (Print)
ISSN 2663-6956 (Online)

ЗБІРНИК НАУКОВИХ ПРАЦЬ
"ПРОБЛЕМИ СУЧАСНОЇ ПСИХОЛОГІЇ"

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2022-55

2022. ВИПУСК 55

c) a fragmentary statement consisting of full and elliptic sentences (from 3 to 5 ones), for example:

S.1: Are you seeing Ann this evening?

S.2: Yes, I am. She's going to come to our place. Do you want me to tell her something? I'll do it if you want.

In the above fragmentary statement the first and the last sentences are both reactive and stimulating. Other sentences can be considered as a monological beginning, which, as a rule, have the character of some statement (explanation, comments).

We followed the facilitative interaction between the expressions of the speaker and the partner of communication. The initiator focuses on the situation, evaluates his/her partner, his/her level of language proficiency, compares his/her speech level, and already the partner of communication perceives the subject and the intention of the speaker, conducts the analysis, and then there is already a statement of the partner of communication.

We proved, that the socio-genetic mechanism of facilitation is the mechanism of cultural transmission: to facilitate means to stimulate, to activate, to create favorable conditions, to make changes and to influence, to support, to help, to care, etc.; a belief in the original, constructive and creative essence of a man as self-worth. The basic influence of facilitative interaction as a process is a belief into the socio-personal nature of facilitation, which actualizes the constructive personal potential of a man in the process of interpersonal communication. The result of facilitation is the concept of necessary and sufficient conditions for effective interpersonal communication that promote the development of personality and to provide constructive personality changes. The procedural side of facilitation at the lessons at secondary school is implied on the principles of synergy – cooperation, interaction, a dialogue; truthfulness and openness; the acceptance of another person as personally significant one; empathic understanding; the formation of skills and abilities which are appropriate for facilitative interaction.

So, the principles of facilitative interaction in the process of interpersonal communication at the lessons are: the development of individual learning route, provoking personal changes of students through learning tasks that contain situations of cognitive dissonance, stimulating students to create them, creating positive conditions for interaction, offering different perspectives on content components; learning (mutual survey, such as a dialogue, an interview, group forms of communication and learning, etc.); conclusions on individual and group tasks with students, the organization of the educational process in dyads, formation of communicative groups, creation of positive preconditions for learning and personal development of students.

Conclusions

It was noted that the facilitative aspects of students' autonomy often impressed with their results: students realized and accepted the need to organize activities in the environment of interpersonal communication as personally significant ones, contributing to their own personal development and providing constructive personal change. Students seek to develop skills of empathic mastery of the context; students are interested in creating positive preconditions for the formation of meaningful learning and personal development in general as a result of the restructuring of personal views in the process of interpersonal interaction; students are aware of their self-sufficiency. Facilitative aspects of human autonomy are actualized through four main methods of interpersonal interaction: persuasion, imitation, suggestion and infection, which are facilitative by their context.

We proved that persuasion is the process of substantiating judgments or inferences. The imitation is the reproduction by a person of certain external features of the behavior, the actions and the activities. Suggestion is considered to be the psychological influence of one person on another; this process is designed for uncritical perception of words, thoughts and desires ex-

pressed by different people. Infection is the process of transmitting an emotional state from one person to another, actualizing the semantic effect of perception in the process of interpersonal interaction. It was noted that when all these methods of interpersonal interaction were explained in the process of the activity, the product of this activity, as a rule, would differ in a creative, non-standard approach and, that is the most important, – these products always all students like.

On the basis of the theoretical analysis of the problem of the correlation of dialogical, psychological, and pedagogical literature, *we developed (by the type of speech reaction) four types of transformation utterances of facilitative interaction at the English lessons*, depending on the processes of internal interference and conceptual correlation: 1) informative facilitative interaction; 2) negative facilitative interaction; 3) inductive facilitative interaction; 4) emotional by nature. All of them will be shown in details in further our publications.

Literature

Crookes G. Planning and interlanguage variation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 1989. Vol. 11. P. 367–383. URL: https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100008391.

Гончарук Наталія, Онуфрієва Ліана. Психологічний аналіз рівнів побудови комунікативних дій. *Psycholinguistics. Психолінгвістика. Психолингвистика.* 2018. Вип. 24(1). С. 97–117. DOI: 10.31470/2309-1797-2018-24-1-97-117.

Ivashkevych Er., Komarnitska L. Psychological aspects of comics as the paraliterary genres. *Збірник наукових праць «Проблеми сучасної психології»*. Кам'янець-Подільський, 2020. Вип. 49. С. 106–130. URL: https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2020-49.106-130.

Mykhalchuk N., Onufriieva L. Psychological Analysis of Different Types of Discourse. *Збірник наукових праць «Проблеми сучасної психології»*. Кам'янець-Подільський, 2020. Вип. 50. С. 188–210. URL: https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2020-50.188-210.

Оллпорт Г.В. Личность в психологии: Теории личности. Москва; Санкт-Петербург: КСП: ЮВЕНТА, 1998. 345 с.

Onufriieva L., Ivashkevych Ed. The development of learner's autonomy by the way of the formation of social intelligence. *Збірник наукових праць «Проблеми сучасної психології»*. Кам'янець-Подільський, 2021.

Вип. 51. С. 9–32. URL: https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2021-51.9-32.

Rogers C.R. Freedom to learn for the 80'S. Columbus : Charles E. Merril Publ. Co. 1983. 312 p.

Стоун Э. Психопедагогика: Психологическая теория и практика обучения. Москва: Педагогика, 1984. 472 с.

Терновик Н., Сімко А. Художня література як засіб формування підлітка як суб'єкта пізнавальної діяльності. *Збірник наукових праць «Проблеми сучасної психології»*. Кам'янець-Подільський, 2020. Вип. 49. С. 322–341. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2020-49.322-341.

Zajonc R., Sales S. Social facilitation of dominant and subordinate responses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 1996. Vol. 2. P. 160–168.

References

Allport, G.V. (1998). *Lichnost v psikhologii: Teorii lichnosti [Personality in Psychology: Theories of Personality]*. Moskva; St. Petersburg: KSP: YUVENTA [in Russian].

Crookes, G. (1989). Planning and interlanguage variation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 11, 367–383. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100008391.

Honcharuk, Nataliia, & Onufriieva, Liana (2018). Psykholohichnyi analiz rivniv pobudovy komunikatyvnykh dii [Psychological analysis of the levels of construction of communicative actions]. *Psycholinguistics. Psykholinhvistyka. Psikholingvistika – Psycholinguistics. Psycholinguistics. Psycholinguistics]*, 24(1), 97–117. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2018-24-1-97-117 [in Ukrainian].

Ivashkevych, Er., & Komarnitska, L. (2020). Psychological aspects of comics as the paraliterary genres. *Zbirnyk naukovykh prats «Problemy suchasnoi psykholohii» – Collection of research papers "Problems of modern psychology"*, 49, 106–130. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2020-49.106-130.

Mykhalchuk, N., & Onufriieva, L. (2020). Psychological Analysis of Different Types of Discourse. *Zbirnyk naukovykh prats «Problemy suchasnoi psykholohii» – Collection of research papers "Problems of modern psychology"*, 50, 188–210. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2020-50.188-210.

Onufriieva, L., & Ivashkevych, Ed. (2021). The development of learner's autonomy by the way of the formation of social intelligence. *Zbirnyk naukovykh prats «Problemy suchasnoi psykholohii» – Collection of re-*

search papers "*Problems of modern psychology*", 51, 9–32. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2021-51.9-32.

Rogers, C.R. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. Columbus : Charles E. Merril Publ. Co.

Stone, E. (1984). *Psikhopedagogika: Psikhologicheskaia teoriia i praktika obucheniia [Psychopedagogy: Psychological Theory and Practice of Teaching]*. Moskva: Pedagogy [in Russian].

Ternovyk, N., & Simko, A. (2020). Khudozhnia literatura yak zasib for-muvannia pidlitka yak subiekta piznavalnoi diialnosti [Fiction as a means of forming a teenager as a subject of cognitive activity]. *Zbirnyk naukovykh prats «Problemy suchasnoi psykholohii» – Collection of research papers "Problems of modern Psychology*", 49, 322-341. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2020-49.322-341 [in Ukrainian].

Zajonc, R., & Sales, S. (1996). Social facilitation of dominant and subordi-nate responses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 160–168.

Хупавцева Наталія, Куриця Денис. Теорія потягу і принципи фасилітативної взаємодії.

Метою *статті є: використовуючи основні положення теорії атракції, сформулювати принципи фасилітативної взаємодії; запро-понувати комплекс вправ для розвитку фасилітативної взаємодії учнів на уроках; запропонувати чотири види трансформаційних висловлювань, які є базовими для фасилітативної взаємодії.*

Методи дослідження. *Для розв'язання поставлених у роботі завдань використовувалися такі теоретичні методи дослідження: категоріальний, структурно-функціональний, аналіз, систематизація, моделювання, узагальнення.*

Результати дослідження. *Доведено, що соціально-генетичним механізмом фасилітації є механізм передачі культури: фасилітувати означає стимулювати, активізувати, створювати сприятливі умови, вносити зміни та впливати, підтримувати, допомагати, піклуватися тощо; віра в оригінальну, конструктивну та творчу сутність людини як самоцінність. Результатом фасилітації є створення необхідних та достатніх умов для здійснення ефективного міжособистісного спілкування, що сприяють розвиткові особистості та забезпечують конструктивні особистісні зміни.*

Процедурною стороною фасилітації на уроках в середній школі є: принципи синергії – співпраця, взаємодія, діалог; правдивість та відкритість; прийняття іншої людини як особистісно значущої; емпатійне розуміння; формування доцільних щодо фасилітативної взаємодії навичок і вмінь.

Висновки. Зазначено, що фасилітативні аспекти автономності учня нерідко вражають своїми результатами: учні усвідомлюють та приймають потребу в організації діяльності в середовищі міжособистісного спілкування як особистісно значущу, сприяючи власному особистісному розвиткові та забезпечуючи конструктивні особистісні зміни; школярі прагнуть самостійно розвивати навички емпатійного опанування контексту; учні зацікавлені у створенні позитивних передумов для формування змістового навчання та особистісного розвитку в цілому в результаті перебудови особистісних поглядів у процесі міжособистісної взаємодії; школярі усвідомлюють свою самодостатність. Фасилітативні аспекти автономності людей актуалізуються за допомогою чотирьох основних методів міжособистісної взаємодії: переконання, наслідування, навіювання та зараження, які є фасилітативними за їхнім контекстом.

Доведено, що переконання є процесом обґрунтування суджень чи умовиводів. Імітація є відтворенням людиною певних зовнішніх особливостей поведінки, дій та діяльності. Навіювання вважається психологічним впливом однієї людини на іншу; даний процес розрахований на некритичне сприйняття слів, думок і бажань, виражених різними людьми. Зараження є процесом передачі емоційного стану однією людиною іншій особі, актуалізуючи семантичний ефект сприйняття у міжособистісній взаємодії. Зазначено, що коли ці всі методи міжособистісної взаємодії експлікуються в діяльності, продукт цієї діяльності, як правило, відрізнятиметься творчим, нестандартним підходом і, що найважливіше, – ці продукти завжди подобаються учням.

Ключові слова: фасилітація, фасилітативна взаємодія, теорія атракції, принципи фасилітативної взаємодії, індивідуальний навчальний маршрут, позитивні умови для взаємодії, позитивні передумови для навчання та особистісного розвитку учнів.