

UDC 378:091.33:008

SOCIAL CULTURAL FACTORS OF METHODOLOGISATION OF THE MODERN UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

L. L. Butenko

This article covers social and cultural factors of methodologization of modern university education in the context of the general tendencies of globalisation, information of formation of education, transformation of the status of knowledge, increase of a role of expert knowledge in society. Features of the modern approach to methodology consideration as doctrines about the activity organisations, the basic signs methodologisation of education in the context activity concepts of vocational training of the future experts are reflected. The basic directions of methodologisation of university education, forms and methods of training of the future experts to special means of the methodological analysis of activity and thinking are characterised. The interrelation of methodologization, fundamentalisation and technologisation of university education as preconditions of maintenance of advancing character of vocational training of the future experts are opened.

Keywords: University education, methodologization, methodologisation of university education, fundamentalisation, social-cultural factors.

Problem in general and its relationship with important scientific and practical tasks. The current socio-cultural space requires the reorientation of the educational process for training specialists who can transform themselves monosubject knowledge into interdisciplinary complexes, work with complex dynamic systems, due to the nonlinearity, multidimensionality of all spheres of the society. Accordingly, the problem of methodologization of education is updated, as a prerequisite for the success of the modernization of vocational training specialists in different fields according to the requirements of the world educational space.

Analysis of recent research and publications related to the solution of this problem and relied upon by the author. Conceptual framework of

methodology as the basis and scope of education is presented in the works of M. Alekseev, O. Anisimova, S. Honcharenko, L. Hur'ye, O. Zinchenko, V. Krajewskiy, M. Kubayevskiy, O. Novikov, O. Popov, A. Furman, G. Schedrovitskiy, P. Schedrovitskiy and others. The main directions of methodologisation of science and education in the scientific papers of the members of the Moscow methodological circle, the founder of which was H. Shchedrovitskiy, are connected with the technological practices in different life and work, the role of methodology in understanding the different spheres of human life and society, and building on this basis of competitive and effective practices.

Theoretical and methodological foundations of methodologisation of the future teachers training were considered by V. Adolf, V. Kravtsov, I. Stepanova, A. Hodusov and others; future engineers – by P. Averychkin, L. Hur'ye, M. Romankova and others. However, the complex issues concerning conceptualization and operationalization of concepts “methodologization of university education”, “methodologization of professional training”, taking into account the totality of social and cultural factors, have not received adequate coverage in the scientific exploration.

The aim of the article is to reveal the essential characteristics of the sociocultural factors of methodologization of the modern university education, to characterize the main directions of methodologization of the modern university education, forms and methods of training of the future experts of special means of methodological analysis of the activities and thinking.

Unsolved aspects of the problem, which the article is devoted to. Analysis of current approaches to the definition of “methodology” is presented in scientific quests by A. Furman and M. Kubayevskiy who noted that some authors understood methodology study on methods of learning and transformation of reality (P. Kopnin, O. Spirkin), others – practical using methods and techniques of learning and activity (A. Zynovyev, A. Furman) and, therefore, “in the first case, the methodology is understood as the science that summarizes and classifies knowledge of the methods of scientific knowledge, that is as the philosophical theory of methods, in the second – as the use of theory to solve practical problems or problems that is as an independent applied discipline, that directly focused away from the formal logic and epistemology.” [6, p. 47]

A. Furman introduced the concept of “methodologization” as “a reflexed away methodological work of the level that enables to increase implementation of a variety of methods, forms and means of human practice

on any subject and can be professional, amateur or primitive, unprofessional, ineffective.” [6, p. 48] The fundamental importance of this approach is in the active, practice-oriented context of the methodological research and methodological activities of the individual. The mentioned above position is the logical and productive continuation of the scientific research of the philosophers of the Moscow methodological circle (O. Zynovyev, G. Shchedrovitskyi and others. Methodologization, according to A. Furman, “is a synthetic manner of the reflexive thinking and acting, combining in one system different ways of thinking – philosophical abstraction, historical and sociological searching, research and development, based on the modeling of objects and producing of thinking beings, forms, images.” [6, 49] Extremely important becomes establishment of methodologization as “the complex and multi-disciplinary professional activity.” [10, p. 6]

Just distinction as the teaching methodology and methodology of how to practice (O. Novikov, O. Popov, A. Furman, G. Shchedrovitski) gives the opportunity to consider “methodologization of university education” as a separate phenomenon.

Problem of methodologization in the field of education includes such concepts as methodological reflection, methodological position, methodological knowledge and skills, methodological competence, methodological culture, methodological competence. In scientific circulation such constructs as “methodologization of thinking”, “methodologization of professional consciousness”, “methodologization of learning content” are used.

Actually methodological knowledge in a very limited format is presented in modern University textbooks. The absolute focus was made on the points of methodology of the scientific research. However, methodological knowledge as a cross-cutting component of professional training of future specialists in the system of University education on the content and the process levels haven't been considered practically.

In the context of training future teachers V. Kravtsov notes that methodologization “can be realized through sociocultural principle of unity and diversity of the content and learning process, through the originality of its forms, which makes it possible to move the focus from information on methodological training, to make the transition from broadcast existing knowledge to the formation of creative thinking.” [5, p. 81] The basis of methodologization of professional training was defined a set of tasks in modeling of the structure of educational activities.

One should completely agree with the opinion of the researchers that “the need for training methodologization process changes the philosophical importance of teacher training, which is not possible only within the academic discipline “Philosophy”. [8, p. 250] Elements of philosophical knowledge should be implicitly included in all training cycles. However, the controversial status of Philosophy among the humanities in universities creates extremely serious obstacles in solving urgent problems of methodologization of university education.

Taking into account the peculiarities of the cognitive activity in the process of professional training A. Arkhangel'skyi and M. Arkhangel'ska note that methodologization of education provides, “a) demonstration to students how scientific knowledge is acquired, what methods are used; b) formation in students the ability to obtain unknown knowledge based on understanding of the substantive and procedural features of scientific knowledge; c) the inclusion in learning content such constructs of philosophy and methodology of science as “principles of scientific knowledge”, “theoretical and empirical levels of knowledge and so on”. [1, p. 157]

The basic principles of methodologization of university education should be recognized the following: the principle of advanced learning, the principle of activity of averaging of methodological knowledge and skills, the principle of reflexive analysis, interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity, professionally-applied orientation, continuity, unity of individualization and differentiation, recursiveness.

Thus, in our opinion, methodologization of university education is associated with the orientation of the content and operational components of the educational process on the methodology of the activities as a system of scientific-cognitive heuristics, rules of procedure, principles and techniques that form the basis of professional activity of a specialist.

Process of methodologization of university education should take into account such socio-cultural factors: globalization of all spheres of society, informatization and the rapid development of the information space, transformation of the status of knowledge and the increasing role of expert knowledge in society.

Globalization as a sociocultural factor of methodologization of university education. The modern world is characterized by the proliferation of transnational economic, political and cultural relations, information technology and global research networks, intense interaction in the international division of labour, which leads to contradictory processes of heterogenization and homogenization of cultural spaces, preparation for life

in the “global lodging” while preserving national identity, combining traditional culture and modernism. [4, p. 137] For University education globalization is associated with the possibilities of creating conditions for academic mobility, exchange of science and practice, the fundamental comparative analytical studies in the field of education, the creation of international research teams and so on. Therefore, the challenges of globalization cause the necessity of the advanced education, ensure of competitiveness of graduates of home universities in the global labour market.

Computerization and the rapid development of the information space. ICT modernize all sectors of society, create its qualitative new infrastructure. Information and theoretical knowledge become strategic resources of post-industrial information society (D. Bell, M. Castells). However, the rapid development of the information space creates many problems. Quite revealing is the idea S. Goncharenko who remarked that “today in the avalanche of information, we suffer from the inability to capture the complexity of the problems, understand relationships and cooperation between things that are to our minds segmented in different areas.” [3, p. 3]

In the context of research of the problems of continuous education S. Vershlovskiy notes that the principal consequence of the scientific and technological revolution of 60-70's in the XX century is an accelerated process of moral and actual depreciation of knowledge and skills. [2, p. 349] In this regard, of particular urgency is the opinion of French sociologist P. Berto who compared the process of devaluation of previously acquired knowledge with the loss of a radioactive element of a half of its mass. Accordingly, the position of “half-life competencies” that indicates the length of time (after graduation), as a result of the emergence of new scientific information and technical expertise of specialists reduce by 50% was offered by P. Berto. Indicative are the results of sociological research by P. Vershlovskiy, “half knowledge devaluation occurred in the XVIII century lifelong of 12 generations, that is, within lifelong of a generation outdated about 10% of the knowledge acquired in the youth. In the mid-twentieth century a half of knowledge obsolete in 5-6 years or depreciate by 97% in the industrial life of the university graduate.” [2, p. 349]

According to US economists, annually 5% of theory and 20% of practical knowledge of experts in different specialties are updated. [2] That is why, the fundamental basis of modern university education must be the rejection of the format of the accumulation of knowledge and their reliance on the established nomenclature, using “yesterday’s knowledge” to solve the

problems of today and tomorrow. Absolute support deserves the position of O. Knyazev who notes that “the universality of the individual is not present in the amount of information held in memory and not in the array of knowledge from different disciplinary areas, and mastering the general system of orientation in the ocean of information, creating a tough of personal filters – clear methods of selection of valuable information, as well as, in shaping skills of constant replenish and building a personal system of knowledge.” [7, p. 370]

The transformation of the status of knowledge in society. In the post-industrial society, “knowledge society” (D. Bell) along with strategies “knowledge for explanation” and “knowledge for understanding” confirms the strategy of “knowledge for development,” which fundamentally changes the vector of training of future specialists towards acquiring knowledge just methodological one as the basis for the synthesis, production of new knowledge in the condition of uncertainty and variability of professional space, forming a methodological way of thinking and communication (A. Furman). Complications of technological bases of production, humanitarian spheres of society determines the need for a multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary complex of knowledge, which actualizes the necessity for the formation of methodological knowledge as oversubject, meta-theoretical, poly-functional. Under these conditions methodological knowledge performs instrumental, predictive, regulatory, structural function.

Enhancing the role of expert knowledge in society. The innovative nature of reforms in all spheres of life causes special attention to the examination of all types of innovation that is not only theoretical but also economic importance (O. Anisimov). According to the formation of expert-analytical thinking of future specialists it should be considered as a compulsory part of the modern university education. Function of such expertise is not only an assessment of innovations, but above all it’s after improvement, provision of broadcasting in the real economy and social sphere of society. Expert thinking requires specific features such as consistency, predictability, independence of judgment, criticism, etc. Special value of the expertise of modern professionals gains in connection with the development of information space, which, thanks to the Internet broadcasts excessive amount of information, the level of adequacy, which requires a balanced scientific expertise. Accordingly, the expert knowledge of the specialized professional knowledge requires thorough methodological equipment, appropriate forms of institutional design.

The urgent need for the current stage of development of university education is implementation of the activity-concept of professional training (V. Davydov, S. Rubinstein, V. Shadrykov et al.). Metaphorical illustration of the need for activity-context of education is quite demonstrative: “We offer hot soup and persistent talk about the historical facts about its origin. And the soup is getting cool ... We give vivid information about the benefits of its ingredients and their benefits for human development. A soup keeps cooling ... We celebrate the most interesting information on with what other food can be combined this soup. And the soup has cooled down. And now we offer it to eat. What? Forgot to give a spoon? But this is a technical detail compared to our wonderful meal.” Or other famous metaphor: “teach to swim first and then pour into the pool water,” etc. In real learning process teacher provides answers to questions that nobody asked him!!!

Thus, real education is not possible outside of culture issues, skills issues and definition of contradictions, the awareness of the limits of their knowledge and lack of knowledge, formation of skills in modeling, design, engineering, including processes of self-thinking activities, cooperation in mixed-age and multi-disciplinary creative teams. The principal ideas as for the success of the process of methodologization of university education: the rejection of understanding the methodology only as add-on theoretical principles of objective knowledge, decision methodology as the scope of practice for the establishment of technology transformation, the production of new knowledge and innovative ideas on specific methodological thinking; building process under study as a unity of two vectors “top job” as a conceptual theoretical research and scientific community “work from bottom” as a direct participation of students as full participants of educational space for the recognition of the urgent need to develop methodological thinking in the context of its competitiveness in educational activities, the labor market, etc.

The main areas of methodologization of university education, in our opinion, we must recognize methodologization of educational content and its technological support. Methodologization of curriculum (M. Alekseev, P. Shchedrovitskyi et al.) means going beyond the principles of shaping the content of training courses, focusing on interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary foundations of scientific knowledge, the individual needs of the individual. Base of methodologization of forms and methods of training future professionals – is learning technologies, methods of work of thinking, formation of readiness for self-education, self education culture based on autopoiesis (U. Maturan, F. Varela). Knowledge should become a means of

solving specific situations and the basis for the production of new knowledge.

The process of methodologization of university education is directly related to its fundamentalization (S. Goncharenko, F. Mayor, O. Subetto, A. Sukhanov and others.). According to O. Subetto, fundamentalization of education includes semantic characteristics: the process of formation of “fundamental-knowledge” skeleton of a personality in education; the process of systematization of the educational process and systematization of knowledge; the process of mutual penetration of basic natural science and human knowledge, the mechanisms of reproduction of fundamentals of culture, morals and values, and etc. [9, p.130] Fundamentalism of universality knowledge is related with universality of knowledge systems, focus on the perception of the world as a whole, integrity, reflexivity. [9, p. 131]

Conclusions. Thus, in the context of globalization, rapid development of information space, improvement of cognitive complexity in all spheres of human activity, the value of cognitive processes that leads to the synthesis, production of new knowledge and methodological value of professional equipment increases. Principal importance gains interrelation and complementarity of subject and over-subject knowledge, using universal mechanisms of methodological reflection, technology, scientific and pedagogical creativity (e.g. technology of problematisation, conceptualisation, visualization of academic and scientific information, etc.).

Prospects for further research relates with the development of structural-functional model of methodologization of university education.

References

1. Arkhangel'skaya M. “Metodologizatsiya” kak element professional'nogo obrazovaniya [“Methodologization” as an element of vocational training] / M. Arkhangel'skaya, A. Arkhangel'skiy, M. Korotyayeva // Vyshee obrazovanie v Rossii. – 2006. – # 9. – P. 156–157.
2. Vershlovskiy S. G. Ot obrazovaniya vzroslykh k nepreryvnomu obrazovaniyu [From adult education to lifelong education] / S. G. Vershlovskiy // Nepreryvnoe obrazovanie kak sotsial'nyy fakt: monografiya [Lifelong education as a social fact: monograph] / N. A. Lobanov, E. Kulya, M. Penkovska; scientific edition of N. A. Lobanov, V. N. Skvortsov; Pushkin Leningrad State University, Research Institute socio-economic and educational problems of lifelong education. – St. Peterburg.: Pushkin Leningrad State University, 2011. – P. 349–395.
3. Honcharenko S. U. Fundamental'nist' profesinyoi osvity – potreba chasu [Fundamentality of vocational education – the need of time] / S. U. Honcharenko // Pedahohichna hazeta. – 2004. – # 12 (125). – P. 3.

4. Entsyklopediya osvity [Encyclopedia of Education] / National Academy of pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine; Editor-in-chief V. H. Kremen'. – Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter, 2008. – 1040 p.
5. Kravtsov V. O. Formuvannya metodolohichnoyi kul'tury maybutn'oho vchytelya u protsesi rozv'yazannya pedahohichnykh zadach [Formation of methodological culture of the future teacher in the process of solving educational problems] / V. O. Kravtsov // Naukovi zapysky KDPU. Seriya: Pedahohichni nauky [Scientific notes of KSPU. Series: Pedagogical Sciences] / ed. by V. V. Radul et al. – Kirovohrad: Kirovohrad Volodymyr Vynnychenko State Pedagogical University, 2015. – Issue 140. – P. 79–82.
6. Kubayevs'kyi M. Metodolohuvannya yak zasib rozumynnya smyslu [Methodologization as as means of sense understanding] / Mykola Kubayevs'kyi, Anatoliy V. Furman // Psykholohiya i suspil'stvo. – 2010. – # 4. – P. 47–57.
7. Sinergeticheskaya paradigma. Sinergetika obrazovaniya [Synergetic Paradigm. Synergetics education]. – Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya, 2007. – 592 p.
8. Stepanova I. Yu. Professional'naya podgotovka uchytelya v usloviyakh stanovleniya postindustrial'nogo obshchestva: monografiya [Professional training in the conditions of postindustrial society formation: monograph] / I. Yu. Stepanova, V. A. Adol'f. – Krasnoyarsk: Krasnoyarsk State Pedagogical University named after V. P. Astafyev, 2009. – 520 p.
9. Subetto A. I. Teoriya fundamentalizatsii obrazovaniya i universal'nye kompetentsii (noosfernaya paradigma universalizma): nauchnaya monograficheskaya trilogiya [Theory of education fundamentalization and universal jurisdiction (noosphere paradigm of universalism): scientific monograph trilogy] / A. I. Subetto. – St. Petersburg.: Asterion, 2010. – 556 p.
10. Furman A. Rivni ta kryteriyi metodolohuvannya u profesynomu zdiysnenni naukovo-doslidnoyi diyal'nosti [Levels and criteria of metodologization in professional carrying out of research activities] / A. Furman // Vitakul'turnyy mlyn: Metodolohichnyy al'manakh. – 2005. – Unit 1. – P. 5–13.

СОЦІОКУЛЬТУРНІ ЧИННИКИ МЕТОДОЛОГІЗАЦІЇ СУЧАСНОЇ УНІВЕРСИТЕТСЬКОЇ ОСВІТИ

Л. Л. Бутенко

У статті схарактеризовано соціокультурні чинники методологізації сучасної університетської освіти в контексті загальних тенденцій глобалізації, інформатизації та стрімкого розвитку інформаційного простору, трансформації статусу знання, підвищення ролі експертних знань у суспільстві. Висвітлено особливості сучасного підходу до розгляду методології як вчення про організацію діяльності, основні ознаки методологізації освіти в контексті діяльнісної концепції професійної підготовки майбутніх фахівців. Схарактеризовано основні напрямки методологізації університетської освіти, форми та методи навчання майбутніх фахівців спеціальних засобів

методологічного аналізу діяльності та мислення. Розкрито взаємозв'язок методологізації, фундаменталізації та технологізації університетської освіти як передумови забезпечення випереджального характеру професійної підготовки майбутніх фахівців.

Ключові слова: університетська освіта, методологізація, методологізація університетської освіти, фундаменталізація, соціокультурні чинники.

СОЦИОКУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ФАКТОРЫ МЕТОДОЛОГИЗАЦИИ СОВРЕМЕННОГО УНИВЕРСИТЕТСКОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ

Л. Л. Бутенко

В статье охарактеризованы социокультурные факторы методологизации современного университетского образования в контексте общих тенденций глобализации, информатизации и стремительного развития информационного пространства, трансформации статуса знания, повышения роли экспертных знаний в обществе. Отражены особенности современного подхода к рассмотрению методологии как учения об организации деятельности, основные признаки методологизации образования в контексте деятельностной концепции профессиональной подготовки будущих специалистов. Охарактеризованы основные направления методологизации университетского образования, формы и методы обучения будущих специалистов специальным средством методологического анализа деятельности и мышления. Раскрыта взаимосвязь методологизации, фундаментализации и технологизации университетского образования как предпосылки обеспечения опережающего характера профессиональной подготовки будущих специалистов.

Ключевые слова: университетское образование, методологизация, методологизация университетского образования, фундаментализация, социокультурные факторы.

Butenko Ludmila Leonidivna – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Pedagogy of Public Institution “Luhansk National Taras Shevchenko University” (Starobilsk city, Ukraine).
E-mail: llbutenko@gmail.com

Бутенко Людмила Леонідівна – кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри педагогіки Державного закладу «Луганський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка» (м. Старобільськ, Україна).
E-mail: llbutenko@gmail.com