TÍTULO: Prestación de servicios educativos en la escuela secundaria: una excursión al desarrollo de la civilización sociocultural.

AUTORES:

1. Prof. Vasyl Madzihon.

2. Ph.D. Nina Fedorova.

3. Ph.D. Svitlana Merkulova.

4. Ph.D. Olena Ostapchuk.

5. Ph.D. Bohdan Piontkovskyi-Vykhvaten.

6. Ph.D. Olena Soboleva.

7. Ph.D. Lidiia Tkachenko.

8. Ph.D. Natalia Kolesnik.

9. Ph.D. Liudmyla Savchenko.

10. Ph.D. Tetiana Rozhnova.

11. Igor Verbovskyi.

12. Prof. Grygoriy Griban.

RESUMEN: Los autores analizan la prestación de servicios educativos a los alumnos en la civilización sociocultural, desarrollado por N. Golovanova en la sección del trabajo científico "Paradigmas de la pedagogía". Allí se fundamentan los conceptos de "educación", "proceso pedagógico (educativo)", "desarrollo", "educación", "humanismo", "paradigma". Los científicos

realizan una revisión retrospectiva de los cambios en los paradigmas pedagógicos desde la Edad Media de Sócrates hasta el siglo XX de J. Komensky y K. Ushinsky.

PALABRAS CLAVES: educación, proceso pedagógico, paradigma, civilización sociocultural.

TITLE: Providing educational services in secondary school: an excursion to the development of socio-cultural civilization.

AUTHORS:

1. Prof. Vasyl Madzihon.

2. Ph.D. Nina Fedorova.

3. Ph.D. Svitlana Merkulova.

4. Ph.D. Olena Ostapchuk.

5. Ph.D. Bohdan Piontkovskyi-Vykhvaten.

6. Ph.D. Olena Soboleva.

7. Ph.D. Lidiia Tkachenko.

8. Ph.D. Natalia Kolesnik.

9. Ph.D. Liudmyla Savchenko.

10. Ph.D. Tetiana Rozhnova.

11. Igor Verbovskyi.

12. Prof. Grygoriy Griban.

ABSTRACT: The authors analyze the provision of educational services to pupils in sociocultural civilization, developed by N. Golovanova in the section of scientific work "Paradigms of Pedagogy". Concepts of "education", "pedagogical (educational) process", "development", "education", "humanism" "kind of paradigm" are substantiated there. Scientists conduct a

retrospective review of the pedagogical paradigms changes from the Middle Ages of Socrates to the twentieth century of J. Komensky and K. Ushinsky.

KEY WORDS: education, pedagogical process, paradigm, sociocultural civilization.

INTRODUCTION.

Substantial transformations in the world economy and social spheres, informatization of social life have made the world a major factor in achieving socio-economic goals of society. Dynamics of globalization processes, formation of information elements of knowledge and joining the European educational space require the Ukrainian society to modernize state system with changing views on the education system as a whole. After all, education determines whether the future of society is civilized and ensures coexistence balance in the world (Antonova, 2004; FItsula, 2006; Kremen, 2019).

The main goal under modern conditions in pedagogy should be readiness of the individual for life, the ability to act, to make decisions, to distinguish between good and evil, as well as to find a place in moral positions, to build relationships in society, to discover the right information and use it successfully, i.e. to be highly qualified and socialized (Slastenin, & Podyimova, 1997; Rudnitska, 2005; Vozniuk, & Dubaseniuk, 2009; Yaksa, 2007).

DEVELOPMENT.

In order to reveal the actual problem in pedagogy about changes in educational paradigms of the topic, the authors of the article analyzed the study of this problem made by N. Golovanova in her research work "Paradigms of Pedagogy". First, let us turn to S. Goncharenko' Ukrainian pedagogical encyclopedic dictionary, which explains some concepts related to the problem identified.

The concept of "education" is considered as a spiritual person, formed under the influence of moral and spiritual values, as the property of personal culture, as well as the process of education, self-education, influence, that is, the process of personality formation. The main thing here is not the amount of accumulated knowledge, but the combination of the latter with personal qualities, the ability to dispose of their own knowledge (Goncharenko, 2011).

Education is the provision of educational services to the younger generation, and pedagogical process (education process) is a purposeful, deliberately organized and dynamic interaction between those who provide educational services and those who receive these services (Boiko, 2014; Dubaseniuk, 2014). This interaction solves socially necessary training and educational tasks. The components of the education goal are: tasks, content, methods, tools, forms of interaction of its participants and the result (FItsula, 2006; Antipova, & Laskova-Yarmolenko, 2018).

Therefore, it is considered that education is a complex and long-term didactic process for a personality is formed, which should become a kind of character in the future (Dzoban, 2014; Chvyrova, 2011). The first component of providing educational services today must be the socialization of personality. This is the process of adaptation of personality in society; mastering her ready-made forms and means of social life; interaction with material and spiritual culture and formation in the personality of their own social experience and lifestyle. Today, a person must be educated and well socialized (Holubovska, 2013; Sisoeva, 2005). The second component must be the manifestation of the essential forces of the individual, that is, their development.

Development is the process of forming personality as a social quality because of socialization and upbringing (Kramarenko, 2009; Smovzhenko, & Skrynnyk, 2015). With the natural anatomical and physiological prerequisites for becoming a person, the child in the process of socialization interacts with the outside world, mastering the achievements of humanity. The development of personality is carried out with activities that are accompanied by a system of motives inherent in it (Goncharenko,

2011). Scientific justification for age periodization, which allows determining changes in the leading types of activities on which education, socialization and education services are built. Education as a whole process includes a subsystem of the process of education.

Education is a process of purposeful, systematic formation of personality, ordered by the laws of social development, by the action of many objective and subjective factors (Golovanova, 2005). Education is a planned influence of parents, school, and society. Ukraine is developing a new holistic system of education for the formation of independence and responsibility, principle and self-esteem, creative activity and critical thinking (Tretko, V. V. (2011; Goncharenko, 2011).

Modern pedagogy from scientific point of view is a set of theoretical and practical disciplines that study education and as a holistic pedagogical process (Yaksa, 2007; Zhukevych, et al., 2019).

Pedagogical knowledge interacts in a special way with each of the branches of human sciences: philosophy, psychology, cultural studies, sociology, economics, etc. Today, pedagogy involves ethnography, semiotics, theology, psycholinguistics and psychoanalysis, which enrich its pedagogical knowledge. However, this process complicates the theoretical search for pedagogy itself. There are risks of "blurring" the subject, increasing the number of approaches to one and the same pedagogical phenomenon.

Personality exists in the environment, with already formed culture. Therefore, the essence of personality is determined by the level of the process of its social integration in the cultural system or civilization.

The process of professional activity with its accumulation of experience from in the beginning is conveyed in myths, legends, and epic poems. This way of transferring knowledge is purely individual and memory-specific. The emergence of information carriers in the system of information transmission has made the humanity of the 21st century more educated and modal. Each civilization built basic pedagogical mechanisms (Golovanova, 2005) and defined the

following mechanisms of civilization: 1) the field of education of the individual (internal / external, body / soul / spirit, mind / heart / will); 2) the orientation of pedagogical action, its orientation to the achievement of practical results and the adoption of a system of religious, ethical, ideological, etc. values, the orientation to useful habits, free creativity in culture; 3) understanding of the nature of childhood, the process of adulthood and the ascent to the ideal; 4) the ratio of personal-individual, social-collective principle in social life and education; 5) the system of vital values.

Considering the history of the development of pedagogical science and education, we see that scientific knowledge has some value of the first order: FAITH – KNOWLEDGE – "I" PERSONALITY (Mareev, & Mareeva, 2004). Accordingly, three main paradigms of pedagogical science are constructed: the first – theocentric, the second – the ratio-centric, the third – the anthropocentric.

The subject of pedagogy is education as a holistic process; the pedagogical paradigm is intended to provide a theoretical model of education. In order for the pedagogical community to be able to refer to this model as the theoretical basis of pedagogical activity, the pedagogical paradigm must substantiate: a) the typological characteristic of the "Image of the child" as the main pedagogical phenomenon; b) the vision of nature, the formation of personality and personality, the essence of the pedagogical process of education, education and development; c) characterization of goals, content and organizational and technological models of education; d) the nature of pedagogical activity, interaction between subjects and objects of the educational process; e) dominating the role of secondary education institutions.

N. Golovanova in her work characterizing the paradigms of pedagogical science uses the thought of a thinker of the twentieth century Pyotr Sorokin, who expressed such a metaphor "... music in the concert hall of history: a large hall, where many symphony orchestras simultaneously play. Listeners only perceive thunder and cacophony. How to deal with such music? There is only one

way: to single out one or two of the loudest orchestras that set the tone for the rest and try to catch up with their musical tempo" (Golovanova, 2005).

An interesting study in N. Golovanova is that it clearly provided age and identification of existing paradigms in the history of education. The author has brought to our knowledge the existence of such paradigms as: the first − theocentric; the second is ratio-centric; the third is anthropocentric. Let's examine each of the paradigms more thoroughly.

Theocentric paradigm of pedagogy.

This paradigm is the first in pedagogy formed by the ideas of ancient philosophers and thinkers of the Middle Ages. The name – theocentric paradigm – indicates the formation of scientific knowledge at the birth of pedagogical thought around the idea of predicting human life higher spiritual principle (the Olympian Gods, fate, the Cosmos, the providence of God). The main values were spiritual values and forms of education and provision of educational services to children. Then history had the philosopher Socrates (468–399 BC), who, for the first time, put the pedagogical thought of a person over social life. Socratic personality formation is self-discovery, the search for moral truths, and to manifest own morally in life. He believed that true knowledge can not be obtained in its finished form, they should be born in the mind of a person during reflection (Shinkaruk, 2002).

Later in the historical development, Plato (427–348 BC) appeared with his works explaining of the process of education. Plato put a lid on soul, so personal development is the "unfolding" of its soul. According to Plato, the human soul is a substance of the supreme "world of ideas" and has three parts: 1) reasonable; 2) strong-willed, 3) sensual and above all – as filling each.

Good education is only able to detect these inclinations from birth and to direct them in accordance with the peculiarities of professional activity and life. Plato's disciple and comrade Aristotle (384–322 BC) believed that a person does not receive any benefactors from birth, but has opportunities

for his own development. This position characterizes the posterior model (from the Latin posteriori − from consecutive ones). Education, according to Aristotle, is a significant process: the educational environment, special activities (learning) that contribute to the formation of vital values (Golovanova, 2005).

The education of medieval Europe was also religious in nature and received by those who wished to become a priest. At that time, the rich, the feudal lords, and even the kings, were not literate. The first sources of Christian education in Western Europe were catechumenates − schools where students studied Holy Writ and were preparing for the sacraments christening. These monastic schools used individually-group forms of education.

The content of religious education for many centuries was based on the guidance of the rhetoric of the rhetorician Marian Capella (V cent.) On the "seven degrees of wisdom": "trivium" − grammar, rhetoric, dialectics and "guadrium" − arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, music theory. "Trivium" was considered a necessary level for any educated person, and in the XI−XII centuries formed the basis for assimilation of "guadrium" and study at universities. In this way, Christian pedagogy sought to solve the problem of raising a child for the earthly and for eternal life (Dzoban, 2014; Golovanova, 2005).

We can identify the main features of the theocentric paradigm of education:

1."The image of the child" is interpreted by the model: the development potential of the child is improved by the conditionality of the Higher Will, by God. Christian pedagogical thought regards man as God.

2. The idea of Divine confession is actively implemented in the theocentric paradigm of education: every person must do what he has been ordained by God, remain in that layer of the society in which he was born.

3. The school that developed until the XVII century has not yet been able to teach children.

4. The Middle Ages – The Ratio-centric paradigm of pedagogy is the heyday of the theocentric paradigm of pedagogy.

Today, when a crisis of one meaningful, comprehensible existence is felt, one pays attention to the values of Faith, hoping for salvation in the future. This paradigm continues to live in the concepts of modernity − the anthroposophical Waldorf pedagogy, the Roerich pedagogy of the living ethics, the teaching of the "Child" by Porphyry Ivanov, etc.

Ratio-centric paradigm of pedagogy.

The Enlightenment (from the 17th to the beginning of the 19th centuries) raised the question: who sets man the limits of existence in this world? Aren't they established by nature, not by God? The boundaries of the human are set by the person himself, thanks to his mind. Belief in progress caused the development of sciences, secular education, and movement for the enlightenment of mankind. The development of the ratio-centric paradigm in pedagogy was carried out in the conditions of formation of a special type of culture – European culture and therefore its main values were introduced. The defining features of the ratio-centric paradigm of pedagogy were: rationalism, sectoral character, utilitarian education, classroom form of teaching, "image of the child", authoritarianism.

Rationalism.

Scientific knowledge focused on the truth that existed abstractly in the world and independently of man (Shinkaruk, 2002; Chvyrova, 2011). Philosophy placed a premium on the honest truth, which was obtained through logical proof and verified by experience. We compare the theoretical substantiation of the essence of the process of teaching in the great didactics of the 17th – 19th centuries (J. Komensky, I. Herbart, K. Ushinsky): J. Comenius – degree: feelings, explanations, exercises; I. Herbart – expressiveness, association, system, method; K. Ushinsky – lively perception

of educational material, comparison and comparison of the received ideas and development of the previous concepts, generalization and bringing of knowledge into the system, consolidation of the acquired knowledge and skills.

Sectoral character.

Education is carried out substantially, by analogy of the sciences by branches of knowledge, division of labor in industry and agriculture. The set of scientific knowledge at school should be clearly divided into classes. J. Komensky wrote: "... that the previous knowledge should logically be continued in the following classes ...". With the development of the sciences until the beginning of the XIX century in European pedagogy there were two perspectives on the content of education. The first is the theory of "data education". Its founder was J. Komensky. His associates promoted the idea of encyclopedic knowledge: the school should provide knowledge of the basics of the sciences and supplement them with information. The second is the theory of "formal education". Its founder was I. Pestalozzi. I. Pestalozzi/s supporters saw training in the development of pupils' cognitive powers and abilities to teach them how to think and express their thoughts. At the end of the XIX century the paradigm of pedagogy has generated, as a result of self-knowledge – knowledge (school for the future) and technology (school for the praxis) of the model.

The "school of study" (book school) dominated educational practice, but had no future. Its characteristic qualities were: only book knowledge is taught; orientation towards general education; teacher and pupils are trained on the model; pupils receive one class assignment per class without sharing information and mutual assistance; Orientation of classes for the average pupil; the pupils personality was suppressed. At the same time, there were also positives: deep refinement of the theoretical and partially didactic foundations of education by eminent European educators of the 18th – 19th centuries; clarity of organization of educational process, sufficient process control; conformity with the values of the rationalistic paradigm of pedagogy.

"School of work" is a school of character formation. Its ideologues and organizers were: in the nineteenth century – I. Pestalozzi, G. Kerschensteiner, in the twentieth century – P. Blonsky, S. Schatsky, S. Frein. This school gives a rational picture of the world and an opportunity for the pupils to use in their own future lives.

Characteristic features of such a school are: the desire to overcome the multidimensional content of the education content, "book" knowledge gave way to independent observation in: laboratories, workshops, school areas, etc.; cognition is done through practical activity, the teacher ceases to be the main medium of information, and there is an opportunity for creativity for teachers and pupils (Golovanova, 2005).

Utilitarian education directs students to the benefit, for further education in higher education, forms a successful owner. The class-based form of education is the main discovery of the rationalist paradigm. It developed in the practice of teachers at the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The theorist for the creation of this system was J. Komensky (1592–1670). The main features of the classroom-lesson system: pupils of the same age in the constant groups (classes), clear planning of each class, teaching of the subjects is carried out in the classroom frontally, lasting 45 minutes. This form of education still exists in secondary schools today.

The image of the child.

The ratio-centric paradigm of pedagogy considered the child as the object of the teacher's actions, because the teacher is the bearer of reason, he can answer all questions. In this context, there is a certainty that it is necessary to study science from childhood. Knowledge is the value for which there is a restriction on freedom, free time, parental communication, rest, etc. The attitude to the pupils as an object of the learning process, forced the teacher to understand the laws of managing his attention, thinking cognitive activity.

Authoritarianism is a characteristic feature of the ratio-centric paradigm of pedagogy. The teacher and students in the educational process occupy asymmetric positions: the first – imposes the goals of learning, content, regulates time, compels certain rules (statutes, rules of conduct, schedule of classes), education in this paradigm is carried out by the principle: "show – explain – perform" and the second one is to perform only. This technology allows you to control students' behavior (the importance of getting points). French sociologist Abraham Mol in the late twentieth century called this product "mosaic culture". This formation occurs in humans accidentally when watching TV shows, reading the press. The doctrine of knowledge offered by the rational-centric paradigm of pedagogy does not allow education to function truly in today's context.

Anthropocentric paradigm of pedagogy.

This paradigm was first applied in pedagogical thought in the Renaissance to culture and philosophy. There is an interest in the antiquity, culture of pre-Christian peoples. The Renaissance affirms the right of man to his own thought and creativity. Renaissance thinkers sought to understand a human figure that became the basis of humanism. Pico della Mirandola said in a statement "Oh, the destination of man": "I put you in the center of the world," says the Creator of Adam, "so that it would be more convenient for you to view everything in the world from there. I would not make you neither heavenly, nor earthly, nor mortal, nor immortal, if you, the free and glorious master, formed yourself in the image that you consider. You can be reborn into a low, incomprehensible being, or you can be reborn according to the command of the soul into the higher, the divine ... About the higher admiration of the happiness of the person who is given to possess what you desire and are what you desire!" (Golovanova, 2005).

The ideas of early humanism that laid the foundations to the anthropocentric paradigm of pedagogy had little influence on the practice of European education. Vittorino de Feltre (1378–1446) entered the experience of pedagogical realization of humanism through the activities of the school "House

of Joy". The existence of the school is considered the true nature of humanists as the first factor of education. Students had to eradicate noble qualities. Dimension and autonomy were cultivated here; attention was paid to physical development. As a humanist philosopher, Vittorino de Feltre introduced the content of the school to ancient classics: Greek, Latin, and literature, as well as mathematics, astronomy, the foundations of social sciences, pupils learned the skills of drawing and cartography. Thus, the ideas of the anthropocentric paradigm of pedagogy in Renaissance humanists' studies shook only the foundations of the geocentric paradigm. This is an indication of how one paradigm changes the other.

In the Age of Enlightenment, when the ratio-centric doctrines of the pedagogical paradigm were flourishing, new ideas emerged – the pedagogical theory of J.-J. Rousseau (1712–1778), who suggested pedagogical values as new: the child's initial perfection; nature, natural education; freedom of education; human-centered education guidance; humanism. Pedagogical concept of J.-J.Rousseau is voiced in the novel "Emil, or About Education", where he describes the free amateur of the child, the formation of his own life experience through observation and work in nature.

It is believed that German educator F. Heathhammer first used the term «humanism» in science. The concept of "humanism" (from the Latin. "Humanus" – human) is considered as: 1) the system of ideas and views on the person as the highest value, 2) humanism (in the historical aspect) is a progressive trend of the Western European Renaissance culture, aimed at affirming respect for dignity, free expression of natural human feelings and abilities. Prominent representatives of humanism were Leonardo da Vinci, T. Campanella, F. Rabelais, J. Bruno, F. Petrarch, T. Mor, J. Comenius, M. Copernicus and others. In Ukraine, humanistic ideas have permeated I. Vyshensky's socio-political views (Goncharenko, 2011).

In Dewey's pedagogical heritage, the humanistic principle of freedom is important. It shows the nature of learning as an individual activity that requires some freedom of thought, judgment. J. Dewey introduced the classroom-teaching system into the technological component of the pedagogical process, replacing it with the "project method". The "forerunners" of the anthropocentric paradigm of pedagogy in the early twentieth century in different countries there are concepts of "free education" and activities of "free schools"; examples include: Maria Montessori (help me do this myself); S. Freene (we only clear the road, and each chooses his own, which corresponds to the individual qualities, tastes and requests); J. Korczak (to teach children to look, understand, love, youth – to want, to be able, to act, and not only to know much); A. O'Neill (… how to cultivate happiness? Abolish power. Give your child freedom); L. Tolstoy (to teach what are the relations between the subjects); K. Wentzel (The House of the free child).

Unfortunately, even today the education system continues fulfilling its avocation – to train a person with knowledge capable for existing in organized society. This has increased the effectiveness of education. In the late twentieth century, Community in the field of pedagogical science began to think about radical changes in the socio-economic life of society, namely: changing the type of culture; transition to post-industrial structure of social and economic life of society; the information revolution, the widespread use of computers as a means of communication; overcoming totalitarianism as the basis of the political system of the state.

The formation of the anthropocentric paradigm of pedagogy is manifested in the peculiarities of modern educational reality. General Secondary Education is losing its traditional function over the centuries.

Modern education is directly linked to the "screen culture", where production, storage, transmission and use are determined by the advances in computer technology. The teacher ceases to act as the main translator of knowledge, so he is less responsible for educational results. The student chooses

the General Means of Secondary Education, the teacher, educational subjects, so he is more responsible for his own knowledge.

The main form of modern production (production of information and services) include activities in small creative groups, where the main is personal communication, organization of cooperation and joint creativity. This tendency is present in modern education, and new tasks are emerging in General Secondary Education: 1) to provide an opportunity for the children's community in which each child will have the opportunity of normal socialization; 2) education of civil society; 3) nurturing communication skills and abilities of the child; 4) nurturing self-interest, providing a reflection and self-education experience

CONCLUSIONS.

We believe that N. Golovanova made an important scientific content analysis, which shows the integrity of human development and education in general, regardless of the years of existence of human civilization. Thus, we can say that the receipt of educational services is designed to change for centuries, and this creates in today's civilizations the consciousness that the individual is a "cog" in these transformations, improvements, development, and that to transform its educational activities and communication and create the need to determine culture and social relations. We have not touched on the development of education today. We consider this our further exploration.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Antipova, O. P., & Laskova-Yarmolenko, A. S. (2018). Transformatsiia osvitnoho dyskursu v konteksti kreatyvnoho skladnyka rozvytku osobystosti [Transformation of educational discourse in the context of the creative component of personality development]. Navchannia i vykhovannia obdarovanoi dytyny: teoriia ta praktyka, 1(20), 15-23. [in Ukrainian].

2. Antonova, O. E. (2004). Bazovi znannya z pedagogiki: stanovlennya, rozvitok, tehnologiya formuvannya [Basic knowledge of pedagogy: formation, development, technology of formation]. Zhitomir: Vid-vo ZhDU im. I. Franka. [in Ukrainian].

3. Boiko, Ya. M. (2014). Osvita ta innovatsiini tekhnolohii [Education and innovative technologies]. Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu, 1(42), 307-309. [in Ukrainian].

4. Chvyrova, O. Ye. (2011). Spetsyfika innovatsiinoho rozvytku vyshchoi osvity u filosofskomu aspekti [The specificity of the innovative development of higher education in the philosophical aspect]. Humanitarnyi chasopys, 3, 23-29. [in Ukrainian].

5. Dubaseniuk, O. A. (2014). Rozvytok vyshchoi osvity: tendentsii ta perspektyvy. [Higher education development: trends and perspectives]. Innovatsii v osviti: intehratsiia nauky i praktyky, 12-28. [in Ukrainian].

6. Dzoban, O. P. (2014). Homo Informaticus: do problemy osmyslennia sutnosti [Homo Informaticus: to the problem of understanding the essence]. Visnyk Natsionalnoi yurydychnoi akademii Ukrainy imeni Yaroslava Mudroho, 1, 13-21. [in Ukrainian].

7. FItsula, M. M. (2006). Pedagogika [Pedagogy]. Kyiv: "Akademvidav". [in Ukrainian].

8. Goncharenko, S. U. (2011). Ukrayinskiy pedagogichniy entsiklopedichniy slovnik. Druge vidannya [Ukrainian pedagogical encyclopedic dictionary. Second edition]. Volinski chari. [in Ukrainian].

9. Golovanova, N. F. (2005). Obschaya pedagogika [General pedagogy]. St. Petersburg: Speech. [in Russian].

10. Holubovska, V. S. (2013). Informatsiine suspilstvo: mozhlyvosti, problemy ta perspektyvy rozvytku [Information Society: Opportunities, Challenges and Prospects for Development]. Informatsiia i pravo, 2(8), 98-104. [in Ukrainian].

11. Kramarenko, A. (2009). Innovatsiini protsesy v osviti: istoryko-pedahohichnyi aspect [Innovative processes in education: historical and pedagogical aspect]. Naukovi zapysky, 5, 4-9. [in Ukrainian].

12. Kremen, V. H. (2019). Innovatsiinist yak vymoha chasu [Innovation as a time requirement]. Retrieved from http://znannya.org.ua/index.php/novini-znannya/nauka-i-suspilstvo/56-filosofiya/286-innovatsijnist-yak-vimoga-chasu. [in Ukrainian].

13. Mareev, S. N., & Mareeva, E. V. (2004). Istoriya filosofii (obschiy kurs) [History of Philosophy (General)]. Moskva: Akademicheskiy Proekt. [in Russian].

14. Rudnitska, O. P. (2005). Pedagogika: zagalna i mistetska [Pedagogy: general and artistic]. Ternopil: Navchalna kniga. [in Ukrainian].

15. Shinkaruk, V. I. (2002) Filosofskiy entsiklopedichniy slovnik [Encyclopedic Dictionary of Philosophy]. Kiyiv: "Abris". [in Ukrainian].

16. Sisoeva, S. O. (2005). Osobistisno orientovani tehnologiyi : sutnist, spetsifika, vimogi do proektuvannya [Personally oriented technologies: nature, specificity, design requirements]. Profesiyna osvita: pedagogika i psihologiya, 153-166. [in Ukrainian].

17. Slastenin, V. A., & Podyimova, L. S. (1997). Pedagogika: innovatsionnaya deyatelnost [Pedagogy: innovation]. Moskva: Izd-vo "Magistr". [in Russian].

18. Smovzhenko, T. S., & Skrynnyk, Z. E. (2015). Ukrainska liudyna v yevropeiskomu sviti: vymiry identychnosti [The Ukrainian person in the European world: dimensions of identity]. Kyiv: UBS NBU. [in Ukrainian].

19. Tretko, V. V. (2011). Suchasni tendentsii innovatsiinoho rozvytku systemy vyshchoi osvity v Ukraini [Current tendencies of innovative development of the higher education system in Ukraine]. Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho natsionalnoho universytetu, 23, 186-188. [in Ukrainian].

20. Vozniuk, O. V., & Dubaseniuk, O. A. (2009). Tsilovi oriientyry rozvytku osobystosti u systemi osvity: intehratyvnyi pidkhid [Targets for personal development in the education system: an integrative approach]. Zhytomyr: ZhDU im. I. Franka. [in Ukrainian].

21. Yaksa, N. V. (2007). Osnovi pedagogichnih znan [Fundamentals of pedagogical knowledge]. Kyiv: Znannya. [in Ukrainian].

22. Zhukevych, I., Okhrimenko, I., Okhrimenko, S., Kazymir, V., Lisnichenko, Yu., Ollo V., et al. (2019). Experimental verification of the effectiveness of the pedagogical conditions for the training of self-education of cadets. Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores. Año: VII, Número: Edición Especial, Artículo no.:82, Período: Noviembre, 2019. https://dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/_files/200006258-6ef056ef08/EE%2019.11.82%20Verificaci%C3%B3n%20experimental%20de%20la%20efectividad%20de%20las%20condiciones....%20(4).pdf.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. Vasyl Madzihon. Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Full Member of National Academy of Education Sciences of Ukraine, Chief Employee of the Department of Innovative Technologies of the Institute of Gifted Child of the National Academy of Education Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine). E-mail: madzighon@gmail.com.

2. Nina Fedorova. Ph.D. in Pedagogics, Senior Researcher, Chief Employee of the Department of Innovative Technologies of the Institute of Gifted Child of the National Academy of Education Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine). E-mail: 4fedorova4@gmail.com.

3. Svitlana Merkulova. Ph.D. in Pedagogics, Associate Professor of English Philology and Translation Department of The Institute of Philology, Kyiv Borys Grinchenko University (Kyiv, Ukraine). E-mail: s.merkulova@kubg.edu.ua.

4. Olena Ostapchuk. Ph.D. in Pedagogics, Associate Professor of the Department of Practical Psychology, Kryvyi Rih State Pedagogical University (Kryvyi Rih, Ukraine). E-mail: ostapchuk_elena@i.ua.

5. Bohdan Piontkovskyi-Vykhvaten. Ph.D. in Pedagogics, Junior Researcher of the Institute of Gifted Child of the National Academy of Education Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine). E-mail: Bogdan.piontkovsky@gmail.com.

6. Olena Soboleva. Ph.D. in Pedagogics, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Theory and Practice of Translation at SBU (Kyiv, Ukraine). E-mail: soboleva13as@gmail.com

7. Lidiia Tkachenko. Ph.D. in Pedagogics, Senior Researcher, Leading Researcher of the Institute of Gifted Child of the National Academy of Education Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine). E-mail: Tkachenko.Lidiya@gmail.com.

8. Natalia Kolesnik. Ph.D. in Pedagogics, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Artistic Disciplines and Teaching Methods, Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University (Zhytomyr, Ukraine). E-mail: natalia1104@ukr.net.

9. Liudmyla Savchenko. Ph.D. in Pedagogics, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Theory and Methods of Preschool Education, Municipal Establishment "Kharkiv Humanitarian Pedagogical Academy" of Kharkiv Regional Council (Kharkiv, Ukraine). E-mail: savchenkoluda1970@gmail.com.

10. Tetiana Rozhnova. Ph.D. in Pedagogics, Head of Licensing and Accreditation Department, Associate Professor of the Department of Pedagogy, Administration and Social Work, State University of Higher Education "University of Educational Management" (Kyiv, Ukraine). E-mail: Rognova_TE65@ukr.net.

11. Igor Verbovskyi. Head of the Training Department, Assistant of the Department of Pedagogy, Professional Training and Management of Educational Institutions, Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University (Zhytomyr, Ukraine). E-mail: super_iagrik2011@ukr.net.

12. Grygoriy Griban. Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Professor of the Department of Physical Education and Sport Improvement, Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University (Zhytomyr, Ukraine). E-mail: gribang@ukr.net.