

Family Pedagogy

# PEDAGOGIKA RODZINY

Kwartalnik

8(4) 2018

ISSN 2543-862X

**Grzegorz Ignatowski** | *Joseph Conrad as the Modern Teacher of Europe (Tragic Fate of Women in Two Short Stories)*

**Barbara Lulek** | *Love, Liberty and Responsibility. Parents and Teachers' Relations in Primary Schools*

**Viktoriia Molochenko** | *Providing Dialogue of Educational Interaction with Students for Formation the Readiness to Partnership*

**Olga Averyanova** | *Problems of Education in the Modern World*

**Dorota Ruszkiewicz** | *Man-father vs. Man Not-father*

**Natalia Dmitrenko** | *Prevalence of Cyberbullying among Ukrainian Young People*



SPOŁECZNA AKADEMIA NAUK  
ŁÓDŹ

**Redaktor naczelny:**

dr Mariola Świdarska

**Sekretarz redakcji:**

dr Mariola Świdarska

**Rada programowa:**

Józefa Brągiel, prof. zw. dr hab., Uniwersytet Opolski, Poland

Arthur Ellis, Professor of Education, Seattle Pacific University, USA

Reinhard Golz, Prof., Leibniz Universität Hannover, Germany

Emilia Janigova, Doc. PhDr. Ing., Katolícka univerzita v Ružomberku, Slovakia

Anna Kwak, prof. zw. dr hab., Uniwersytet Warszawski, Poland

Tadeusz Pilch, prof. zw. dr hab., Uniwersytet Warszawski, Poland

Andrzej Radziejewicz-Winnicki, prof. zw. dr hab., Społeczna Akademia Nauk, Poland

Łukasz Sułkowski, prof. zw. dr hab., Społeczna Akademia Nauk, Poland

Andrzej Michał de Tchorzewski, prof. zw. dr hab., Uniwersytet Gdański, Poland

Mikołaj Winiarski, prof. zw. dr hab., Społeczna Akademia Nauk, Poland

Anna Žilova, Prof. PhDr., Katolícka univerzita v Ružomberku, Slovakia

André Boyer, Prof. Emérite, Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis, France

Cristina Montesi, PhD, Università degli Studi di Perugia, Italy

Abdel Hakim Doukkali, Prof., Université Internationale de Casablanca, Morocco

Maria Uramova, Prof. Ing., PhD., Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia

Mariola Świdarska, dr, Społeczna Akademia Nauk, Poland (przewodnicząca)

**Redaktor naukowy numeru:**

Grzegorz Ignatowski

**Redakcja „Pedagogiki Rodziny. Family Pedagogy”:**

Społeczna Akademia Nauk

ul. Sienkiewicza 9, 90–113 Łódź

42 664 66 21, e-mail: mariouka@wp.pl

© Copyright by Społeczna Akademia Nauk

ISSN: 2543-862X

**Skład i łamanie, korekta:** Jadwiga Poczyczyńska

**Projekt okładki:** Marcin Szadkowski

Wersja elektroniczna jest wersją pierwotną.

Wszystkie artykuły naukowe w czasopiśmie zostały zrecenzowane zgodnie z wytycznymi Ministerstwa Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## DISSERTATIONS

**Grzegorz Ignatowski**

*Joseph Conrad as the Modern Teacher of Europe (Tragic Fate of Women in Two Short Stories) .....* 7

**Barbara Lulek**

*Love, Liberty and Responsibility. Parents and Teachers' Relations in Primary Schools .....* 15

**Viktoriia Molochenko**

*Providing Dialogue of Educational Interaction with Students for Formation the Readiness to Partnership .....* 27

**Alla Davidchuk**

*Choice in the Structure of Readiness for the Value Self-determination of Senior Pupils .....* 35

**Oksana Voloshyna**

*Deontological Aspects in Teacher's Professional Training .....* 45

**Viktor Tarantei, Adam Bujak**

*Tackling Social Exclusion of Older People .....* 53

**Olga Averyanova**

*Problems of Education in the Modern World .....* 67

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

**Dorota Ruskiewicz**

*Man-father vs. Man Not-father* ..... 83

**Joanna Dworakowska, Agata Tymicka**

*The Feeling of Emotional Support on the Part of Parents vs. Sexual  
Initiation of Female Students before Coming of Age* ..... 95

**Natalia Dmitrenko**

*Prevalence of Cyberbullying among Ukrainian Young People* ..... 107

**Viktoriiia Molochenko<sup>1</sup>**

Faculty of Management and Law

Vinnitsia National Agrarian University

## **Providing Dialogue of Educational Interaction with Students for Formation the Readiness to Partnership**

**Summary:** The article analyzes the theoretical conditions of providing dialogical character of educational interaction with students, identifies the features of the main components of educational interaction: dialogical relations, personal positions of participants, active joint activities, information connections at the value-semantic level.

**Key words:** external dialogue, internal dialogue, dialogical relations, personal positions of participants, active joint activity, informational connections on the value-semantic level.

The nature of interpersonal relationships both in the professional sphere and in the educational process has a decisive influence on the formation of the personality of the future specialist. Under the conditions of educational interaction, constructed on a subject-subject basis, both sides communicate as equal participants in the process of communication. Under this condition, it is established not the interrelationship “teacher-student”, but interpersonal contact, which results in a dialogue, and hence, the greatest susceptibility and openness to the influence of one participant in communication to another. The ability to interact on an affiliate basis optimizes positive changes in the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral spheres of each of the participants in the learning process.

---

<sup>1</sup> rubchuk@bigmir.net

Raising the role and personality values decisively influences the nature of the relationship between the teacher and the student in the process of their interaction, the signs of which are interactivity, complicity, mutual understanding. In this regard, at the present stage of the development of a higher school, there is a need for the active implementation of dialogical forms and methods of interaction between a teacher and a student.

In the process of communication, the formation of the relations of the participants of the educational interaction takes place, and the dialogic nature creates an opportunity to adjust the peculiarities of these relationships in the context of respect for one's personality, tolerance, and the identification of everyone's potential. Thus, dialogue is not just communication, but such interaction, which essentially determines the effectiveness of professional training, providing an opportunity to identify the positions of subjects in solving problems associated with future activities. Due to the dialogic nature of the educational interaction, the intellectual positions of its members complement each other, forming an entire, which can not be reduced to a simple sum of components.

In the context of our study, the position of M. Buber and his developed system of interconnections, "I and You" [Buber 1993] deserves attention. The philosopher believes that the main factor in the development of the individual is the dialogue as a special form of relations with other individuals. An analysis of the features of communication that accompanies these relationships allows us to distinguish between external and internal dialogues, the characteristics of which determine their functional difference. Internal dialogue is a special form of human communication with itself in the individual mental process. Dialogue between "I" and "I-another" is possible in the presence of different properties, qualities and interests. Acquiring the skills of internal dialogue during the professional training of specialists in higher educational institutions is very important for their further development in future activities. The main communicative function of internal dialogue is the compensation of defects in communication, consisting of a deficit of "positive", a desirable, necessary personality for communication or an excess of "negative", undesirable, inhibiting communicative contact with a real interlocutor. With the help of internal dialogue, a person retains significant autonomy from real communication partners, without ceasing to be the subject of communication. Thus, the internal dialogue creates the preconditions for achieving a person of a higher level of understanding of partners, a new level of communicative competence. The ability of internal dialogue is inherent in every person, is a natural feature, which is based on the ability to see oneself from the side, personal reflection. At the same time, these skills each have different degrees of severity. On the other hand, the ability of dialogue within one consciousness, when "the other" is placed within the individual, acquire a higher level of development in the process of subject-subject communication between partners and can be developed in the socio-psychological communication training.

So, internal dialogue is a compulsory component of not only self-identification of a person, but also complex forms of communication between man and another person, since “a person is able to enter into an actual, effective, productive dialogic” [Bibler 1975, p. 264], which raises real communication with another person to a higher degree. In the description of the external dialogue, researchers note the active bilateral nature of the interaction of communication partners [Beh 2000]. Intense bilateral interaction is associated not only with the dialogue-dispute, but also with dialogue-consent, in which the views of the partners coincide and largely complement each other. It is the culture of dialogue-consent that is especially important in the field of education, learning-communication. In contrast to the external dialogue, the external monologue is a form of asymmetric interaction. In this form of communication, the influence exercised by the subject of communication on the listener is much stronger than the impact of the listener on the speaker. For a typical external monologue, not only the lack of expressiveness of the position of another in the form of an external language, but also the completeness, finality of the semantic structure of the statement, its independence from the position of the interlocutor. However, this does not diminish the role and significance of the monologue and does not mean its negative evaluation.

Important in connection with the acquisition of student-agrarian skills of partner interaction is that the basis of the dialogue is the orientation towards the search for unity, the access to the level of development and self-development of the teacher and the student as equal participants in the educational process. Their equality is confirmed by the humanization of education. The humanist position of the teacher is expressed in the ability not to magnify the professional over the human, but in the ability to see, in any external manifestations, the student's right to individuality. Humanity is an inner setting expressed in respect for the student judgments and ways of expressing them, his spiritual world, the autonomy of the decisions made, self-esteem and the dignity of others, life's self-determination. The principal importance of recognizing the subjectivity of another in the process of interaction is that it is a necessary condition for self-realization, self-understanding, self-determination of each of the direct participants in the learning process through “clarification of oneself in dialogue” [Muntian 2006, p. 131]. The problem of constructing dialogical relations in the process of educational interaction was significantly updated at the present stage of the development of scientific pedagogical thought and reflected in the concept of personal education (O. Bondarevskaya, V. Serikov, E. Shiyarov, I. Yakimanskaya), in which the concept of dialogue is interpreted in different plane of interpretation. In the conditions of the culturological approach to the implementation of self-directed education, developed by O. Bondarevskaya, dialogue is a way of existence and self-development of man in the cultural and educational space, one of the main values of culturological person-oriented education [Bondarevska 1999, p. 257].

V. Serikov, considering the dialogue as one of the central provisions of the concept of person-oriented education, considers it a universal characteristic of the pedagogical situation, which has a decisive influence on the personal development of the individual. The dialogue in this sense is presented as a specific socio-cultural environment, which creates favorable conditions for gaining personal and professional experience. The dialogue appears not only as one of the methods of learning, but also as an integral component, the internal content of personality-oriented learning technology. Dialogism is in this case one of the essential characteristics of the educational process, an indicator of its transition to the personality-semantic level; dialogue is not only a means but also an end in learning not only process but also content, source of personal experience, factor updating of content-forming, reflexive, critical functions of personality [Serikov 1999]. In the research of V. Serikov, the levels of formation of dialogical relations are distinguished: the rigidly determined attitude of the learner to the correct answers; exchange of independent statements; mutual understanding; desire for self-disclosure; the desire to understand another; search for a new truth [Serikov 1994]. We emphasize that the dialogue serves as an instrument for creating a person-oriented learning situation, during which, thanks to the question-responsive form of communication, there is a specially organized accumulation of students experience in implementing value-based elections, critical perception of information, reflection of creative approaches to solving problems. In accordance with these functions, the skills of partner interaction can be formed by students in the following types of dialogue: “motivational”, “self-representational”, “autonomous”, “critical”, “conflict”, “reflexive”, “sensory”, “self-realizing”, “spiritual” [Lysina 2005].

At all stages of the process of training future specialists in the agrarian sector are dominated by verbal interaction that takes place during classroom sessions and provides an opportunity to create a favorable microclimate, an atmosphere of mutual respect, mutual understanding. It is important that the communicative side of dialogic communication is connected, first of all, with the processes of transmission and reception of information. It is a question of interpersonal interaction in the “teacher-student” system, the main condition of which is mastering the knowledge (rules) of communication that occurs during solving certain problem situations.

During the dialogic interaction mutual knowledge, mutual influence, creative process is developed, which enables the teacher to better understand the student's individuality, activate his cognitive abilities, develop emotional and value perception of reality, and the student – to reveal his own individuality within the limits of that reflexive space that is formed in the process. dialogue [Serikov 1994]. For a productive dialogue, not only common language is required, but also the difference in the level of awareness of the partners in the subject of



communication, the actual vision of the subject of communication with each of the partners, which differs from the views of other participants in the dialogue.

Analysis of psychological and pedagogical literature suggests that there are such functions of dialogical interaction, as constructive, communicative, transformative. The constructive function is aimed at jointly solving problems in the classroom, self-regulation of learning activities and extra-curricular communication on self-improvement. The communicative function is expressed in the ability of the student in a verbal form to take an open position in relation to the problem of discussion, thus updating the personal experience of those who are studying, becoming professional thinking, acquiring communicative skills of a future specialist [Davydova 1989]. The transformational function of the dialogue is connected with the possibility of humanization and democratization of the relations between the participants in the dialogue, the search for the ways that promote the establishment of interpersonal interaction. The real process of designing a professional round-table dialogue makes the students a direct participant in the meeting to find a common solution to their tasks.

The decisive influence of dialogic interaction in educational and educational situation on the formation of readiness for partnership interaction in professional activity gives grounds to distinguish its main structural components: dialogical relations, personal positions of participants, active joint activities, informational connections at the value-semantic level.

The relationship between a teacher and a student is ideally thought of as dialogical in the broadest sense of the word. This is an equal relationship with the preservation of freedom and independence of both parties. The equality of the teacher and the student is, in the human right of knowledge of the world and themselves within the limits established from the inside, in the right to the individual inner world and life experience, the price of which appears on the world, illuminates the human image, that is, and the actual education is carried out” [Lysina 2005]. In the process of establishing dialogical relationships, the peculiarity of the subjective world of each dyad “teacher-student” is revealed, which is determined by the difference in age, erudition, life and professional experience, parenting, and performing social roles. At the same time, semantic equality is established, which is based on a dialog approach and serves as a starting point for the joint promotion of subjects of the educational process to the goal. Dialogical relationships, for which the principle of dialogue interaction is decisive, are characterized by efforts of the participants in the dialogue, aimed at convergence of their positions, strengthening of interpersonal contacts, ensuring a positive background for communication.

*The personal views* of the participants in the learning interaction as a component of the dialogue are very significant, since, on the one hand, they influence the nature of the dialogue, but on the other – they are created. The position in the dialogue is not just the orientation of consciousness, which is outlined by a certain

sum of opinions that are customary for an individual, this is the property of a person, his “identity”; not a private opinion on a partial question, but self-determination about the main values of life; not an abstract-theoretical principle, but a way of responsible inclusion in life [Davydova 1989]. In the dialogic study, taking an open position, the teacher carries students not only the abstract knowledge system, but also passes on their knowledge, vision of the problem, skills and skills necessary for socialization. Accordingly, students, taking a position in educational interaction, acquire the ability to express their own views, protect them, and search for a “team” of like-minded people, which will provide a greater probability of an optimal solution to the study task.

Thus, dialogic interpersonal relationships lead to a change in social roles, “when one does not teach much, how much creates conditions for self-realization and self-development of the personality of another” [Muntian 2006].

A dialogical approach to the construction of educational interaction does not exclude the need for a permanent purposeful correction of relations, since the teacher is not insured against the emergence of “abnormal”, unpredictable situations of a conflict nature. It is meaningless to ignore them, since this is a reality of pedagogical reality, which can not be guaranteed either by consistent humanization in the field of education, or by studying the system of methods of correction of relationships. Another reality may be the transformation of pedagogical conflicts into creative possibilities. Teaching through the prism of his own perception, personal experience allows the teacher to simulate the attitude towards this material students. The advantage of this position is that under certain conditions it causes students not to resist, but the desire to open up. Such a method of implementing a dialog approach requires pedagogical intuition, tact, psychological mood, consideration of each lesson in the background of the previous educational interaction between the teacher and students.

In the context of constructing a dialogic interaction in the classroom, an indirect link of interpersonal relationships is an active joint educational activity, which involves abandoning dictation in relation to communication partners, finding solutions that reflect the values of the subjects of the educational process. “The community in this case does not mean the abandonment of independence! It's about the other – about rejecting a position when only your opinion is correct” [Pirova 2005]. Joint activity as a component of dialog interaction is the process of combining the individual efforts of subjects of learning, in which the right to own development is realized on the basis of the desire for an integrative result. The structure of the joint educational activity contains the general purpose and specific tasks, the motives for engagement and joint actions aimed at achieving overall results. The need for the association, distribution and coordination of individual actions prompts students, participants in active joint activities, to choose certain strategies of behavior.

With the last of the components of dialog interaction – information links at the value-semantic level – there are certain transformations. Researchers note the emergence of new trends in the formation of the value-semantic sphere of personality: the transition from “large”, “general” values to fragmentary, the relative fragmentation of values into smaller ones, the reconfiguration of “debris” into individual value complexes [Serikov 1999]. As one can understand, all these individual differences in the value-semantic sphere of future specialists complicate the process of professional training for interpersonal communication and, moreover, partner interaction. The optimal solution to this problem is the formation of more or less stable microgroups in the training group, in which due to the need to interact in order to solve a specific task acquire value orientations, similar in nature to the ideals of a true labor collective. In this way, the bias of orientations from short-term values that are determined by the benefits of interaction, on the long-term values, which mark the transition of students to a higher level of awareness of the values of future professional activities, cooperation, collective efforts aimed at achieving universal development.

The analysis of the organization of educational interaction on the basis of the dialogic approach allowed to reveal the peculiarities of its main components – external and internal dialogue as the optimal forms of acquisition of the skills of partner interaction, the conditions of their implementation in the classroom, as well as such components of dialogue interaction as dialogical relations, personal positions of the participants, active joint activity, informational connections at the value-semantic level. Based on the above-mentioned components, we consider dialogical interaction in the classroom as a process of mutual influence of the teacher and students for the purpose of development and self-development of the skills of partner interaction on the basis of an open personal position of the partners in communication, dialogical understanding as a common search for common ways of solving problems, values and semantic ties, characterizing the orientation of subjects of educational activity to cooperation.

## Bibliography

Бубер М. (1993), *Я и Ты*, Москва.

Библер В.С. (1975), *Мышление как творчество (Введение в логику мысленного диалога)*, Москва.

Бех І.А. (2000), *Спілкування як загальна психологічна основа виховання особистості. Інститут проблем виховання АПН України. Морально-духовний розвиток особистості в сучасних умовах: зб. наук. Праць*, Київ, Кн. 1, pp. 10–17.

Мунтян С. (2006), *Методичні реалії розвитку діалогічного мовлення учнів, Українська мова і література в школі*, Київ, No. 6, pp. 2–5.

- Бондаревская Е.В., Кульневич С.В. (1999), *Педагогика: личное в гуманистических теориях и системах воспитания: учеб. пособие для студ. сред. и высш. учеб. заведений, слушателей ИПЖ и ФПК*, Ростов на Дону.
- Сериков В.В. (1999), *Образование и личность. Теория и практика проектирования педагогических систем*, Москва.
- Сериков В.В. (1994), *Личностно ориентированное образование*, Москва, No. 5, pp. 16–21.
- Лысина М.И. (2000), *Личностно ориентированное образование: феномен, концепция. Технологии: Монография*, Волгоград.
- Пирова С.И. (2005), *Уроки гуманизма*, Душанбе.
- Давыдова Г.А. (1989), *Творцы и функционеры*, No. 10, pp. 34–39.