The Process of Facilitative Learning as the Basis of the Humanization of Education

Процес фасилітативного навчання як основа гуманізації освіти

Khupavtseva Nataliia

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

Хупавцева Наталія

Доктор психологічних наук, доцент,
професор кафедри загальної психології та психодіагностики,
Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет,
м. Рівне (Україна)

Lohvina Oksana

Ph.D. in Psychology, Assistant Professor,
Assistant Professor of the Department
of General and Applied Psychology,
Kamianets-Podilskyi National Ivan Ohiienko University,
Kamianets-Podilskyi (Ukraine)
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0359-5850
E-mail: oksanalogvina19@gmail.com

Address for correspondence, e-mail: kpnu_lab_ps@ukr.net

Логвіна Оксана

Кандидат психологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри загальної та практичної психології,
Кам'янець-Подільський національний університет
імені Івана Огієнка,
м. Кам'янець-Подільський (Україна)

The author's contribution: *Khupavtseva Nataliia – 50%, Lohvina Oksana – 50%*

Авторський внесок: *Хупавцева Наталія – 50%, Логвіна Оксана – 50%*

ABSTRACT
The purpose of our research is: to develop (by the type of speech reaction) four types of transformation utterances of facilitative interaction at lessons, which depend on the processes of internal interference and conceptual correlation of the definition "facilitative learning as the basis of the humanization of education"; to organize the pilot research of facilitative interaction of pupils at the English lesson (form 5-A, 42 pupils, school № 12, Rivne) during 2020-2021 years.

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

The results of the research. In order to test our hypothesis about facilitative activity of pupils, its productivity or non-productivity, we compared the results of respondents' cognitive activities when they worked alone and in the case of the implementation of facilitative activity in the presence of observers. It is proved that these two indicators were correlated again after some training (when cognitive activity was performed several times). While testing our hypothesis, it was found the most accurate physiological indicator to register changes in the level of arousal of the personality. A similar research was organized the next month. In this research, pupils performed appropriate tasks to actualize psychomotor skills in the presence of observers. The results showed that the presence of ten passive observers during the mastery of a highly complex of mental and psychomotor skill worsened the activity of respondents significantly at the beginning of the empirical study compared to training alone.

Conclusions. It was proved, that C. Rogers' ideas on the importance of the process of facilitative learning, the role of the teacher, his/her facilitative relationships with pupils were the basis for the humanization of education abroad, and the main empirical research was provided in the 60-70's. The results of the facilitation training, which involved thousands of teachers and tens of thousands of primary, secondary and college schoolchildren in England and the United States, suggested that pupils' personal development had also been improved: their self-esteem had been improved, cognitive abilities had been developed, which facilitated the improvement of physical and mental health, performance and the activity of schoolchildren.

C. Rogers' humanistic ideas, which contribute to the growth of educational potential, are especially important for the democratization of the Ukrainian school and our society. In the theory of C. Rogers we often see implied system of certain ideas about a man and his/her essence, or a special method of psychotherapy, or just a set of carefully designed techniques for correcting interpersonal relationships.

Key words: facilitative learning, the humanization of education, cognitive activity, physical and mental health, productive facilitative activity of pupils, non-productive facilitative activity of pupils.

Introduction

While analyzing the concepts of *education, teaching, learning (in Ukrainian «навчання», «викладання» і «вчення»)*, C. Rogers emphasizes that in today's world of constant changes the emphasis in the learning process has to be shifted from teaching to facilitation as a manifestation of a new thinking, as a real reform of education, which can not be achieved by improving skills, knowledge and abilities of teachers, nor through the development and the implementation in the learning process of experimental programs and modern technical learning tools (Rogers, 1983).

In the psychological paradigm (Гончарук & Онуфрієва, 2018) facilitation is seen as stimulating the development of people's consciousness, their independence, freedom of choice, rather than trying to make them dependent on public opinion. Thus, facilitation is traditionally analyzed as a change in the

effectiveness of the subjects of educational activities. Freedom does not mean permissiveness and release from professional responsibilities. If leading professionals, leaders in education are able to realize their role as facilitators, the educational paradigm will potentially change.

The discussion of the terminological problem of the definition of "facilitation" is indicated by the requirements formulated by L. Onufriieva & Ed. Ivashkevych. Scientists believe that, first of all, the facilitative interaction itself should be objective and holistic in a systemic and functional sense. Secondly, this term should be taken unambiguously: to denote one phenomenon that has a fairly clear paradigm. It is unacceptable to denote several phenomena by one term and, conversely, it is undesirable when one phenomenon is denoted by several terms. The existence of synonyms is sometimes justified, and in some cases inevitable. Thirdly, the etymological aspects of facilitative interaction should be considered. Fourthly, it is necessary, if it is possible, to take into account the traditions formed in Psychology. Fifthly, the procedural and productive aspects of facilitative interaction should be separated. Sixthly, the terminology of related sciences needs to be taken into account as an effort to avoid interdisciplinary contradictions (Onufriieva & Ivashkevych, Ed., 2021).

Thus, the term of "facilitative activity" in the paradigm of psychomotor learning is quite ambiguous, because it has a double meaning. Activity is usually seen as purposeful, deliberate behavior, that is observed for a relatively short (limited) period of time (Михальчук & Онуфрієва, 2020). However, this term has another, more special meaning for behavior, which this definition had been received after thorough training of respondents, when additional training led to only a slight improvement in a movement; that is, the right movements had become dominant (Оллпорт, 1998). Learning is seen as a continuous process of changing behavior during training. In terms of the theory of facilitative learning it is a process of changing the dominant action

in the direction from direct to indirect change (Івашкевич, Ер. & Комарніцька, 2020).

In our research, facilitation refers to *a person-centered approach*, having been expressed in a global sense of trust of a person, by the tendency to personal growth, the development and the realization of his/her individual potential. Facilitation is a key concept of non-directive, client-centered or person-centered psychotherapy developed by C. Rogers. To understand the essence of facilitative interaction, the main principles of C. Rogers theory are: a belief into the original, constructive and creative wisdom of a man; a belief into the content of socio-personal nature, which implies the actualization of the constructive personal potential of the individual in the processes of interpersonal communication; the main concepts are "necessary and sufficient conditions" of interpersonal communication, which contribute to the development of the person and ensure the implementation of constructive personal changes ("unconditional positive perception of another person", "active empathic listening", "congruent self-expression in the process of communication"); the ideas about real stages of the group process that takes place in certain social and personality-centered conditions (Rogers, 1983).

For our research it is very important to distinguish between *two types of learning*: unconscious and conscious ones. The first type of education is so called "impersonal", intellectualized, evaluated from the outside, with the aim of mastering the pupils' knowledge. Learning of the second type, on the contrary, is self-initiated, personally meaningful, such one that it has an impact on the individual as a whole, it is evaluated by the pupil to ensure mastery of meanings (or so called meaning frames) as the main elements of personally meaningful experience. The main tasks of the teacher are to stimulate and to initiate (promote) absolutely conscious learning.

The purpose of our research is: to develop (by the type of speech reaction) four types of transformation utterances of facilitative interaction at the lessons, which depend on the processes of internal interference and conceptual correlation of the

definition of "facilitative learning as the basis of the humanization of education"; to organize the pilot research of facilitative interaction of pupils at the English lesson (form 5-A, 42 pupils, school № 12, Rivne) during 2020-2021 years.

Methods of the research

The following theoretical methods of the research were used to solve the tasks formulated in the article: a categorical method, structural and functional methods, the methods of the analysis, systematization, modeling, generalization. Also in our research we used the empirical method of pilot experiment. In our experimental research 42 pupils from the form 5-A of the school № 12 in Rivne were participated.

The results of the research

On the basis of our pilot research of facilitative interaction of pupils at the English lessons we developed (by the type of speech reaction) *four types of transformation utterances of facilitative interaction* at the English lessons, which depend 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 facilitative interaction.

Here are the examples *of four types of transformation utterances of facilitative interaction* at the English lessons:

1. Informative facilitative interaction:

   a) message information:
   – Jane speaks Ukrainian fairly well.
   – Her brother speaks Ukrainian, too;

   b) whispering, refinement:
   – *I've seen this film.*
   – *Have you really seen this film?*

   c) advice:
   – *I'd like to become a teacher.*
   – *Wouldn't you like to become an agronomist instead?*

d) confirmation:
  – *I hear Alec is going to Kyiv.*
  – *That's right, he's going there next week;*
e) promise:
  – *Mind you don't lose this book.*
  – *I promise I shan't lose it.*
f) reference to someone:
  – *I'm planning to enter a university after school.*
  – *Your brother told me you were planning to enter a uni-versity.*

2. Negative facilitative interaction:
  a) disagreement:
    – *It's good to set up for a trip on Sunday.*
    – *I don't think it's good to set up for a trip on Sunday (that day).*
  b) contrasting:
    – *Let's go to the Black Sea this summer.*
    – *No, let's go to the Altai mountains instead.*
  c) denial:
    – *You missed two lessons last week.*
    – *But I didn't miss any lesson last week.*

3. *Inductive facilitative interaction:*
  a) order:
    – *I've been at school, not at the river.*
    – *Go and tell your father where you have been.*
  b) request:
    – *Could one of you open the window, please?*
    – *Yes, of course. Pete, open the window, please.*
  c) invitation:
    – *All the tourists generally visit this castle.*
    – *Look here: why not visit this castle tomorrow?*

4. Emotional by nature facilitative interaction:
  a) doubt:
    – *I can carry it.*
    – *I doubt you can carry it. It's too heavy.*

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

ЗБІРНИК НАУКОВИХ ПРАЦЬ
"ПРОБЛЕМИ СУЧАСНОЇ ПСИХОЛОГІЇ"

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2022-56

2022. ВИПУСК 56

b) surprise:
– *I saw Nick yesterday.*
– *Did you really see him? He isn't in town.*

c) uncertainty:
– *He will come at six.*
– *He may come at this time but I'm not sure.*

As we know, the question-answer is a partial dialogical unity in the real acts of communication. Questions are always communicative, they have the aim to facilitate the partner of communication and require a response from him/her. Thus, a question is simultaneously a call to a speech reaction. In the practice of teaching foreign languages, questions may be both conditional and real-motivated. So, if the supervisor asks the pupils: *Why did not your father come to the university to see me as I asked you on Monday, Sydorenko?* (the teacher really asked the pupil's parent to come to school), then this is a real question, and a specific answer should be given.

But at the lesson the teacher can ask a lot of other questions, for example: *What color is the blackboard? How many doors are there in the classroom? What is Petrenko doing now? (Etc.)* The answers to these questions are known to those who asks, since they are related to reality. These questions are communicative only in form. In context they are conditional, representing only the form of educational actions, which lead to automatic replicas in the process of dialogical communication.

Here are the examples of the main structural and semantic groups of questions that stimulate the expression of teaching and training replicas (pupils' answers are free, and they use the verbal fragment of questions). *All these questions are facilitative by their nature.*

Questions on the topic "Our School":
– *What kind of the school is ours? (It's a newly-built school, a three- storeyed house).*
– *How many classrooms are there in it?*
– *How many windows are there in this room?*

− *How many pupils are there in this class?*
Questions on the topic "Weather", "Dates":
− *What is the weather like today?*
− *What season is it now?*
− *What's the date today?*
−*What day is it today?*
Questions about "My favorite subject at school":
− *What subjects are taught now?*
− *What exams do you take at the end of the year?*
− *What foreign languages are you taught?*
− *What is the most difficult subject at school program?*
Questions about pupils' actions:
− *What are you doing now?*
− *What are your classmates doing now?*
− *Is Petrenko standing near the blackboard?*
− *Why is he standing at the blackboard?*
Questions about the theme "Clothes":
− *What do we put on when it's hot (cold, frosty, raining, etc.)?*
− *When do we wear a raincoat?*
− *What's Ann wearing now?*
− *Do we wear a fur cap in summer?*
Questions regarding occupations of a person, as well as according to the subjects that are used:
− *What do we call a person who teachers pupils?*
− *What do we call an object on which pupils write with chalk?*
− *What do we call a specialist who treats pupils who are ill (consults the sick person)?*
Questions about objects' descriptions:
− *What is this object (thing) made of?*
− *What colour is it?*
− *What are its dimensions (Is it big or small)?*
− *Is it heavy or light?*
− *Can a boy of 14 carry it?*
Questions regarding the use of colloquial formulas:
− *When do we say "Hello!"?*

– *Whom do we greet saying "Hello!"?*
– *When do we say "Thank you"?*
– *When do we use the word "please"?*

The main types of questions are known to be general, alternative and special one. The simplest answers are to common questions. For educational purposes pupils are often offered to answer full sentences (after incomplete answers):

Teacher:
– *Is our classroom small?*
– *Does this classroom face the shop (a yard)?*

A pupil:
– *No, it isn't. It isn't small (It's large).*
– *Yes, it is. It's small.*
– *Yes, it is. It faces the university yard.*
– *No, it isn't. It doesn't face the shop (yard) (It faces the street).*

The reliance on pupils' ability to respond to questions and to respond to empirical statements, as well as non-standard forms expressing confirmation or denial (*of course, surely, by no means, that's right, etc.*) is of great importance.

– *Do you often take books from the library?*
– *How often?*
– *Do you often go in for sport?*
– *What sport do you go in for?*
– *Surely (yes, rather). (Not very often).*
– *Once a fortnight. (Once or twice a month).*
– *Yes.*
– *Swimming.*

Alternative questions partly contain an answer themselves:
– *Must we do this exercise orally or in a writing form?*
– *We must do it orally.*

Pupils can give both laconic or elliptical (incomplete) answers for special questions, but detailed explanations:
– *What do we usually put on when it rains?*
– *A raincoat.*

– As a rule, a raincoat.
– We put on a raincoat.
– When it rains we usually put on a raincoat.

As it was noted above, replicas in the usual dialogue are not always correlated with each other as a question – an answer. In a free conversation the partners react productively to such statements as assertion (assessment, judgment, statement, informing, aphorism), invitation, expression of emotions and others. But is it possible in high school to teach students more or less widely to speak in response to a replica that does not contain the requirement (an invitation) to speak? Students themselves create the content of the statement and, what is especially important, they freely choose the form of its expression (relying, of course, on the previously learned language material).

As practice shows, pupils' performance of *replicative exercises* is not only necessary but also possible *for organizing facilitative interaction at the English lessons*. It should be noted that pupils should be taught to participate freely in such forms of the activity in accordance with the typology of dialogical unities (including questions and answers). So, *we distinguish the following varieties of replicative exercises (according to their communicative structure)*:

1) *affirmation – a question* (replica in response is expressed by surprise, doubt, questioning, clarification, assumption, desire to receive additional information, etc.);

2) *assertion – assertion* (replica in response expresses confirmation, consent, judgment, promise);

3) *confirmation of the negation* (replica in response expresses disagreement, protest, contestation);

4) *motivation – a story* (the replica contains questions or prompts).

We'll show the examples of each kind. So, we'd like to propose sentence-stimuli and possible reactions to them:

1. a) specify the details:
– I'm going to the country.

− *I like watching television.*

− *What for?*

− *For how long?*

− *Are you going to stay there all the holidays?*

− *When do you usually watch TV?*

− *What programs do you like to watch?*

b) Check the veracity of the statement:

b.1) Express surprise:

− *It takes me almost an hour and a half to get to the stadium where I train.*

− *Do you live so far?*

− *Does it really take you so long?*

b.2) Ask about information leakage: Pete's collection of postage stamps won the third prize:

− *How do you know?*

− *Who told you that?*

b.3) Ask for an explanation:

− *I won't see Jack any more.*

− *What do you mean?*

− *What do you mean by saying "any more"?*

2. a) Please tell us what you are talking about:

− *I'm crazy about music.*

− *I like tennis more.*

b) Agree with the statement and if it is possible − inform us about something else:

− *Sometimes it's very cold here in autumn.*

− *Yes, rather. And not sometimes but always.*

c) Express your doubts:

− *Pete and I will go fishing tomorrow, we'll be at the lake at 4 in the morning.*

− *I doubt you'll go there. Pete never gets up so early.*

d) Exchange with a partner by politeness formulas:

− *I'm very sorry.*

− *Thank you very much.*

− *That's all right.*

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

COLLECTION OF RESEARCH PAPERS
"PROBLEMS OF MODERN PSYCHOLOGY"

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2022-56

2022. ISSUE 56

– *Don't mention it.*

e) Give confirmation and clarify what the partner said:

– *You've found the way very quickly.*

– *Yes, I was shown the way by a passer-by.*

3. a) Do not agree with the statement:

– *Buses are usually empty in the morning.*

– *Every city with a population of a million has the underground.*

– *I don't think that's correct. They are usually full during rush hours.*

– *That isn't always true. There's a number of cities which haven't the underground.*

b) Deny and correct the partner of communication:

– *There are 30 days in May.*

– *That isn't right. May has 31 days.*

c) Fix the affirmation:

– *Alex says you're going to stop training because you've hurt your arm.*

– *Nothing of the kind. I'm not going to stop training, I haven't hurt my arm.*

4. React to the order:

– *Bring the spade, please.*

– *But I have already brought it.*

– *Yes, but give me the key from the shed.*

On the basis of our pilot research of facilitative interaction of pupils at the English lessons (form 5-A, 42 pupils, school № 12, Rivne), we can conclude that the use of *such types of dialogical unities positively influence the facilitative interaction of pupils*: the answers about smth. – 30%, the questions – 6%, the story as answering the questions – 16%, a story-narrative – 34%.

Thus, this pilot research shows that organizing facilitative interaction of pupils at the English lesson with educational mechanisms of conceptual correlation and internal interference will contribute the development of dialogical speech of pupils at the English lessons.

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

ЗБІРНИК НАУКОВИХ ПРАЦЬ
"ПРОБЛЕМИ СУЧАСНОЇ ПСИХОЛОГІЇ"

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2022-56

2022. ВИПУСК 56

In order to test our hypothesis about facilitative activity of pupils, its productivity or non-productivity, we compared the results of respondents' cognitive activities when they worked alone and in the case of the implementation of facilitative activity in the presence of observers. We proved that these two indicators were correlated again after some training (when cognitive activity was performed several times). While testing our hypothesis, we found the most accurate physiological indicator to register changes in the level of arousal of the personality. A similar research was organized by us the next month. In this research, pupils performed appropriate tasks to actualize psychomotor skills in the presence of observers. The results showed that the presence of ten passive observers during the mastery of a highly complex of mental and psychomotor skill significantly worsened the activity of respondents at the beginning of the empirical study compared to training alone.

The result of our research was also interesting, however, when after the respondents had developed a strong enough facilitative skill the psychomotor task in the presence of observers respondents had begun to perform much better than alone, and this proved that the presence of outsiders was largely arousing. Our hypothesis about the remarkable role of the presence of observers was confirmed in the other our research, when we used the technique of senso-motor examination using a rotating disk.

Conclusions

C. Rogers' ideas on the importance of the process of facilitative learning, the role of the teacher, his/her facilitative relationships with pupils were the basis for the humanization of education abroad, and the main empirical research was provided in the 60-70's. The results of the facilitation training, which involved thousands of teachers and tens of thousands of primary, secondary and college schoolchildren in England and the United States, suggested that pupils' personal development had been improved: their self-esteem had been improved, cognitive

abilities had been developed, which facilitated the improvement of physical and mental health, performance and the activity of schoolchildren.

C. Rogers' humanistic ideas, which contribute to the growth of educational potential, are especially important for the democratization of the Ukrainian school and our society. In the theory of C. Rogers we often see implied system of certain ideas about a man and his/her essence, or a special method of psychotherapy, or just a set of carefully designed techniques for correcting interpersonal relationships. C. Rogers emphasizes that in today's world, which is characterized by constant changes, the emphasis in the learning process must be shifted from teaching to the facilitation of learning. C. Rogers sees such a change in the learning process as a manifestation of a new thinking, as a real reform of education, which can not be achieved either by improving the skills and abilities, knowledge and possibilities of teachers, or by developing and implementing new experimental programs and state-of-the-art technologies, funds, etc.

C. Rogers' theoretical ideas, his concept of facilitative development of the person are also actively used in the situations of facilitative communication. Since the 60's and until nowadays, the ideas of the scientist have significantly influenced the development of methods and technologies for the educational process. Among all the representatives of Humanistic Psychology, in our opinion, only C. Rogers managed to create an author's concept of facilitative learning.

Literature

Гончарук Н., Онуфрієва Л. Психологічний аналіз рівнів побудови комунікативних дій. *Psycholinguistics. Психолінгвістика. Психолингвистика.* Переяслав-Хмельницький, 2018. Вип. 24(1). С. 97–117. URL: https://doi.org/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.

References

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.

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

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 research 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.

Хупавцева Наталія, Логвіна Оксана. Процес фасилітативного навчання як основа гуманізації освіти.

Метою статті є: розробити (за типом мовленнєвої реакції) чотири типи трансформаційних висловлювань фасилітативної взаємодії на уроках, які залежать від процесів внутрішньої інтерференції та концептуальної кореляції визначення «фасилітативне навчання як основа гуманізації освіти»; організувати пілотне дослідження фасилітативної взаємодії учнів на уроках англійської мови (клас 5-А, 42 учні, заклад середньої освіти № 12, м. Рівне) упродовж 2020-2021 років.

Методи дослідження. Для розв'язання поставлених завдань використовувалися такі теоретичні методи дослідження: категоріальний, структурно-функціональний, аналіз, систематизація, моделювання, узагальнення. Також у дослідженні використано емпіричний метод пілотного дослідження.

Результати дослідження. Здійснено порівняння результатів виконання респондентами пізнавальної діяльності, коли вони працювали наодинці, та у випадку її здійснення в присутності спостерігачів. Доведено, що ці два показники знову співвідносили після деякого тренування (коли пізнавальна діяльність виконувалась декілька разів). Перевіряючи гіпотезу, було знайдено найбільш точний фізіологічний показник для реєстрації змін рівня збудження особистості. Подібного роду дослідження було проведено нами наступного місяця. У цьому дослідженні учнями виконано відповідні завдання з метою актуалізації психомоторики в присутності спостерігачів. Результати засвідчили, що під час опанування великою мірою складним мисленнєвим та психомоторним навиком присутність десяти пасивних спостерігачів значно погіршувала діяльність респондентів на початку проведення емпіричного дослідження порівняно з тренуваннями наодинці.

Висновки. Доведено, що ідеї К. Роджерса щодо значущості процесу фасилітативного навчання, ролі вчителя, його фасилітативних взаємостосунків з учнями було покладено в основу гуманізації освіти за кордоном, і основні емпіричні дослідження були здійснені у 60-70-их роках. Результати фасилітативного навчання, в якому брали участь тисячі вчителів і десятки тисяч учнів початкових, середніх шкіл і коледжів в Англії і США, дозволили стверджувати, що спостерігається розвиток особистості учнів: покращилася їхня самооцінка, розвинулися пізнавальні

DOI (article): https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2022-56.171-188

здібності та здатності, що, в свою чергу, фасилітувало поліпшення фізичного і психічного здоров'я, успішність та активність школярів.

Показано, що гуманістичні ідеї К. Роджерса, які сприяють зростанню освітнього потенціалу, є особливо важливими для демократизації української школи і суспільства. Зазначено, що в теорії К. Роджерса найчастіше бачать або імпліковану систему певних уявлень щодо людини та її сутності, або особливий метод психотерапії, або всього лише сукупність ретельно розроблених технік корекції міжособистісних взаємостосунків.