

UDK № 168522

**CULTUROLOGICAL “KNOW-HOW” IN THE SYSTEM OF SPECIALISTS
TRAINING IN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS
OF I-II LEVEL OF ACCREDITATION**

Hub’jak V.D., Hub’jak M.V.

**КУЛЬТУРОЛОГІЧНІ «НОУ-ХАУ» В СИСТЕМІ ПІДГОТОВКИ ФАХІВЦІВ
У ВИЩИХ НАВЧАЛЬНИХ ЗАКЛАДАХ І-ІІ РІВНЯ АКРЕДИТАЦІЇ**

Губ’як В.Д., Губ’як М.В.

The object of the research are transformational processes in the system of culturological education in historical aspect as until recently culturology was a part of anthropology, archeology and history, but today the concept of culture consists of all spheres of human activity including ones which are known as science and system of science. It means that methodological chaos appeared not only regarding educational discipline of culturology but regarding scientific one on the first place.

The article emphasizes the necessity of an integrated approach to preparation in the process of training a specialist in a higher educational institution, identifies one of the most effective ways of solving this problem, that is the formation of a system of culturological skills through the introduction of integrating cultural models.

Keywords: *cultural education, Bologna process, genesis, integration, transformational process, ethno-social structure, culturology, regional peculiarities, innovations and technologies*

Cultural education in Ukraine nowadays is in a difficult situation associated with the formation of new strategies for the development of Ukrainian education as a whole, which is based on the principles of globalization and regionalization; integration and diversification of educational structures, unification of special fields of training specialists, innovation of training technologies. In these conditions, it is particularly relevant to study the peculiarities of cultural education in the regions as the basis for the development of all Ukrainian education.

The aim of this research is to analyze cultural education, its historical aspect, place, and role in the social development of the state.

The subject of the study is the transformational processes in the system of cultural education, the historical aspect.

It is known that the term “history of culture” arose at the beginning of the twentieth century in connection

with the study by anthropologists of backward, so-called primitive cultures. Note that there are many definitions. Therefore, a relatively small factual material (compared with the civilizations of the West and the East), manifested in the culture of many tribes of America, Africa, and Asia, which belonged to several hundred, and even dozens of people, such a term was fully applicable and justified. But with the further development of science, this term began to lay claim to a methodological principle of studying all past and present civilizations, regardless of their size and range. However, until recently, history of culture, as a rule, was located within the framework of anthropology, archeology, and history, but today, all areas of human activity are covered by the notion of culture, including those that are known to us under the name of science or systems of sciences. In other words, the methodological chaos appeared not only in relation to the educational but, above all, in relation to the scientific discipline of cultural studies [8, 12].

Hence, a second problem arises, which is directly related to the question of developing a model of cultural education. It is connected with the lack of scientific criteria for the structuring and systematization of knowledge of the culturological cycle, since the uncertainty of the notion of culture does not allow us to take as a basis one or another approach to the assessment of empirical material, to which we refer well-known interpretations and theories of cultural level. Therefore, we have to be guided by both the most authoritative sources on the given problem and to use the experience of domestic and foreign experts on the problem of teaching cultural studies, and own developments in this field.

Since the task of constructing a model of cultural education is still posed with definiteness, inevitably in the process of this work analysis and experience will be formalized both in the educational and in the scientific

discipline of culture at the same time. Therefore, we consider it necessary to structure and systematize material for the cultural educational cycle, based on our clearly defined viewpoint regarding the main methodological approaches and basic concepts in the field of cultural studies. [4, 18].

The task set before the educational model to ensure and preserve such fundamental criteria of the integrity of cultural knowledge as continuity, make us appeal to the basic methodological approach when selecting material for educational discipline "history of culture" at different levels of education, from musical schools to higher education institutions. This approach should be connected not only with the system or structure of culturological knowledge but also with the age of children [5, 24].

In our view, without a more or less clear definition of the subject of cultural studies, at least in the most general form, we can not justify and substantiate the linking of the architectonics of cultural education. Without going into theoretical explanations and analysis of existing theories, we can state that culture in the broadest sense is a combination of modes of existence and human livelihood, as well as their results in the past, present and future time on the scale of all humanity living on Earth. From this definition, we see that the subject of the history of culture is both a static and dynamic system, and this gives us the opportunity to apply the primary distribution to study it.

By statics, we understand the completed results of the types and ways of human activity in the past, its achievements in different cultures, ranging from the methods of extracting fire to masterpieces of art. By the dynamics of culture, we understand the mechanisms and processes of change and development, which can be attributed, including any socially significant events that, one way or another have changed the look of human society in the past or present. Speaking about the history of things and the history of events, we remain within the broadest and undifferentiated edge of understanding of culture, namely, within the framework of universal or general cultural consciousness [12, 149].

Following this, a new, more in-depth understanding of the essence of culture opens, namely, the level of detection and knowledge of the laws in the cultural process and in cultural achievement. Here there is a differentiation of the general field of universal history into the history of locally existing groups of people, united by numerous factors and conditions. Of the many known histories of civilizations, each of them becomes a subject of study consistently (to one degree or another), as a result of which we become aware of the diversity and dissimilarity of cultures, their uniqueness. Each studied socio-cultural field appears in the form of a whole world inherent only in its methods of thinking and feeling, management and religious worship, the development of art styles and conduct of military operations. Here, statics and the dynamics of culture are limited to one culture, one society, which has an analo-

gy with human life cycles - birth, development, maturity, and death [10, 416].

At the next level, the study of the subject of cultural studies we begin to recognize the statics of culture as a theoretical object, as an abstract object, that is, the structure of culture. In this case, the main forms of human activity, excepted in human society, their roles, the place and significance of each of them in relation to man, culture, and society as a whole are determined. The dynamics of the theoretical object - culture as integrity - will allow us to understand the systemic connections and relations of all structural elements, all cultural phenomena among themselves and in relation to their whole [10, 416].

Thus, we have the methodological and technological principles according to which culturological education should be formed. The first is the principle of chronology, the linear time according to which all events and things known today, ranging from the origin of the first person and to the present-day historical situation on the planet, are raised as a single forward process. The chronological methodological and technological principle in constructing a model of culturological education is intended to play the role of the quantitative factor when the emphasis is on obtaining the maximum amount of knowledge. By the way, this very methodological principle was almost entirely reigning both in education and in world science: a well-known historical theory shared the history of mankind in the hereditary periods of time in the history, in which it was formed, namely, "Ancient world - Middle Ages - New time - Newest History". In our view, this approach to the historical process is relativistic and legitimate only at the initial stages of the study of human history.

The second technological principle in culturological education can be called cultural-historical, it is intended to form students' perceptions of the cultural diversity of the world through the study of specific cultures of the past and present. This principle in education should promote the elimination in the minds of people of national and cultural centrism when each culture is understood as a unique achievement of a huge group of people to which the criteria of evaluation of any other civilization are not applicable [11, 360].

The third technological principle in approaching the construction of a model of culturological education in Ukraine is the culturological principle in the selection and presentation of knowledge. At this level of preparation, when there is already a great deal of historical and cultural-historical information, culture should be presented as an abstract study object, in which two main points are distinguished: structural, or static, and systemic, or dynamic. It is at this stage, in our opinion, that information on the origin and history of the development of cultural science as a science should be presented, as well as the main and most well-known theories on the interpretation of culture as such.

But in order for the whole amount of knowledge that is studied in educational institutions to be included

in culturological training, it is necessary to order it in accordance with certain principles - principles of culturological development of knowledge. This requires, first of all, to identify the role and content of history of culture as a science. Among the numerous interpretations of the history of culture in the system of scientific knowledge the most common are the following two: first, history of culture is represented as the assembly of human sciences and, secondly, as interdisciplinary science [4, 26].

In the first interpretation, cultural studies act more like a cultural science, in which each scientific discipline is a part of the general space of human knowledge and relations with the world, and their unity is provided by the general basis, source, and cause of occurrence - human creative activity. In the second interpretation, cultural science is seen as a discipline that stands above other sciences, for which the source and the target point is a way of understanding, interpreting the world, and the knowledge of man about it. In this sense, history of culture is a special edge of consciousness, which is located above other spheres of human knowledge and which deals only with explanation of every historical event, every artistic image or mode of management as a historical type, a model of human activity that has a structure and obeys a single pattern in its appearance and actions. In our view, both interpretations of cultural studies as a scientific and educational discipline have the right to exist [4, 28].

Culturological training involves the achievement of certain qualities by students that would enable them to operate the basic cultural concepts and to reveal the principles of the cultural level in individual events or phenomena. Therefore, the interpretation of culturology as a cultural science, as a system of human sciences, sciences about human creative activity, can be used as a methodological principle of providing information to students before culturological training. It means that a huge field of information about the world and about a person, about their relations (contradictions and unity) among themselves, should not simply be provided within the limits of already existing educational disciplines, but with the emphasis on:

1. external (chronological) and internal (logical) connection of the main historical stages of the development of one or another sphere of knowledge;
2. connection of the investigated historical phenomenon, event or discovery with historical conditions accompanying them in other spheres of public life. In this case, the student will form such a vision of a single historical fact in which this fact itself will be considered in connection with other facts of history that preceded or followed the investigated phenomenon [2, 16].

When forming such student's attitude to the studied phenomenon, it is necessary to clearly indicate the general basis, the cause of the connection of these phenomena, which is originally present in each event or phenomenon of history, namely human activity. A student must receive a sufficient foundation for acting in

the consciousness at the culturological level, that is, actions must be aimed at achieving understanding of the single fact as part of the overall human process. If such an emphasis is made, this will be the first and main factor for the formation of a student's cultural understanding of history and the present.

The second point to be ensured in the culturological training of students is to determine the condition of connection between individual facts and historical phenomena, namely the concept of time. The chronology can be presented as an irresistible flow of many events in the history of human society, and therefore the correlation of each historical fact with the time period can and should not only be a necessity for the emergence of history as such, but also an opportunity to understand the emergence of certain historical events. In this case, a specific historical time can and must be understood and presented as a condition of coincidence of many events in different spheres of human society life, ranging from the methods of warfare to the creation of works of art, or even the formation of styles and entire areas in art, literature, etc. Therefore, the chronological coincidence of different in appearance events or historical facts should attract the attention of students and create, in this way, the preconditions for the formulation and solution of issues inherent in the culturological level [6, 62].

The two above-mentioned moments relate to the chronological method of student's culturological training in choosing and providing information. These two points form the basis of the chronological principle in culturological education and are aimed at the formation of the culturological level in the consciousness, the student's perception of the fact of history or modernity. Both time and human society are manifested, in this case, in a non-differentiated form, as a common substance of events, and allow humanity to be represented as a unit that lives in time under unified and immutable laws. This allows, on the one hand, to provide education in general with humanistic nature and direct the student to the perception of individual strange cultures, and on the other hand - to form the cultural basis of perception and understanding of information about a person as a generic being, despite the various racial, ethnic, cultural and other differences between people. The method of chronology in culturological education should be used at the first stage of the student's cultural training [14, 86].

At the second stage of culturological preparation, the main method of selection and provision of information should be the cultural-historical method. The peculiarity of this method is the appearance of new connecting facts of history. To the already described two connecting elements of the history of mankind - time and human activity - a few are added, the main of which are:

- 1) the notion of culture or civilization;
- 2) ethno-social structure of the studied cultural or civilizational systems [13, 128].

The notion of culture at this stage is introduced as a formal historical concept. The understanding of culture as a result of human activity in time is accompanied by an understanding of culture as a regional-historical whole in the space of human civilizations, human history in general. Here the spatial and temporal distribution of the historical process is introduced, different historical cultures are selected, which can be described and confirmed by historical evidence and archaeological materials. Cultural-historical method is connected with the fact that the student begins to see the historical process not only as a single line in time and space but also as a historical process of development of many different cultural entities, characterized by specific features [15, 94].

On the other hand, the concept of culture, limiting the overall historical process of space-time frameworks, at the same time, is a common core for all events, phenomena, and facts of the studied cultural-historical system. Linear time appears, in this case, as the only scale on which there exist and develop various rather closed cultural institutions, within which all spheres of society are interdependent. This creates the necessary preconditions for preparing a student for a more complex cultural analysis of historical facts in the future, as the diverse life of society appears as a whole and, therefore, every branch of life, from economics to art, is perceived as dependent on all others. Although structural analysis at this level of culturological training is not yet used, the emergence of a systemic vision of culture as a complex organism is already becoming an inalienable attribute of the study of any cultural integrity.

The second element that plays the same dual role, as well as the concept of culture in relation to history and human, is the ethnos and mentality or ethno-social community. Just as the notion of culture is an element that separates the integrity of the historical process into locally-geographical, cultural-historical complexes, the concept of ethnos introduces differentiation into student's knowledge of a single humanity. Despite the fact that humanity is a real notion and no matter how different people are between themselves, they are equally related to the human race, it is not just an integer, but an integral set consisting of elements - ethnic groups, nations, peoples [10, 16].

In modern textbooks on history, civilizations are studied according to geographical and chronological features, briefly mentioning the peoples living in the specified territories. Meanwhile, it is necessary to distinguish the ethnic element into one of the most important components of the cultural-historical process, because ethnos are the creators and bearers of cultural traditions. For example, it's a mistake to speak of the culture of ancient Rome, because ancient Rome is a huge geographic and national feature of the branch of ancient history, which includes many conquered cultures, for example, Egypt. It would be more correct to consider the culture of peoples and the role of each of them in the Roman Empire [2, 37].

A similar emphasis on the ethnic basis of each culture, every civilization complex should not only make the student aware of the diversity of the human race but also prepare him for the perception and understanding of different cultures, no matter how distant they seem at first glance. In addition, the ethno-social division of cultural-historical formations will help the future cultural scientist to form readiness and, at the same time, the professional ability for intercultural communication, unthinkable without the prior awareness of the ethnic and cultural diversity of history and modern times [6, 172].

The culturological stage in culturological education is characterized by the achievement of the main goals and objectives of culturology in general, namely:

1) training of specialists in culturology, able to use professionally the basic cultural concepts, to operate freely with a cultural apparatus for the analysis of cultures, their structural parts and forms of interaction between them, to understand the tendencies of occurrence, development and decline of the cultures common to all cultures, patterns of the appearance of cultural models, styles and arithmetic reactions etc.,

2) search and definition of perspective directions of scientific researches in the field of culturological knowledge, in a deeper and more accurate understanding of mechanisms of cultural achievement and intercultural communication. These tasks are faced with the university and after-university stages of culturological training [8, 18].

The peculiarity of this stage is the use of the characteristic cultural method in the selection and submission of information, in the development and completion of those educational areas of cultural education, which were involved in the previous stages, in order to ensure the continuity of culturological training and culturological knowledge itself. Cultural method of selection and submission of information to students and postgraduate students consists of previously developed forms of chronological and cultural-historical analysis of the history of human life, as well as in the structural and systematic analysis of typical, archaic mechanisms of existence and cultural dynamics [14, 76].

Many events in the life of one cultural and ethno-social community should be analyzed in the direction of finding the sole basis for their manifestation, the finding of some common archaic patterns for them, which constitute the content of a particular cultural tradition. At this stage of culturological preparation, it is important to study the structure of ethno-cultural integrity, structural elements and their relationships between themselves and the whole, as well as studying the effect of these elements in social dynamics. In addition, the function of both structural elements of culture and society, as well as the function of cultural-historical education as a whole, as interdependent cultural traditions and ideas in the single spatial-

temporal flow of human existence, is an important subject of the study. [3, 10].

One of the most important subjects of culturological education at this stage is the deepening of knowledge on the study of sign systems of different peoples and their cultures, both of which are passé and modern ones. The problem of intercultural communication today is very acute because this is one of the causes of misunderstandings and conflicts between different countries. Therefore, the understanding of the uniqueness of each cultural tradition, along with the penetration into the content of what is happening, is possible only on the basis of an in-depth study of the semantic and semiotic features of the cultural languages of many peoples of the world [9, 116].

The most important element in the culturological training of students at this stage is the concept of structural unity of all known cultural and historical institutions today, despite their difference in scale and external forms of manifestation. In essence, it is a question of studying the abstract object - culture as a system in which the visible phenomena of social life are linked by an invisible but very strong bond of structural properties. Every fact or phenomenon of the history of a particular culture is considered in relation to others not only in relation to a single time scale, not only in relation to the common cultural-historical space in which it was discovered, but also in relation to the most functional structure of the whole cultural integrity, in which this fact or phenomenon acts as a feature and form of deep meaning - the structural and functional part of a unified cultural system [18, 147].

References

1. Khudozhno-estetychne vykhovannia shkoliariv u pozauronchnii diialnosti: Prohrama. – K., 2002.
2. Kontsepsiia kulturolohichnoho rozvytku osobystosti v NVK №28 m. Dnipropetrovska // Mystetstvo i osvita. – 2001. – №3.
3. Parlamentski slukhannia z problem rozvytku vyshchoi osvity // Osvita. – 2004. – № 23. – 12–19 travnia
4. Andrushchenko V. Modernizatsiia vyshchoi osvity Ukrainy v konteksti Bolonskoho protsesu // Osvita. – 2004. – № 23. – 12–19 travnia.
5. Baidenko V.Y. Bolonskyi protsess: strukturnaia reforma vysshei shkoly. – M.: YTsPKPS, 2003.
6. Hynetsynskiy V.Y. Znanye kak katehoryia pedahohyky: Opyt pedahohycheskoi kohytolohyy. – L.: Yzd-vo Lenynhr. un-ta, 1989. – 244 s.
7. Holovaty M.F. Yevropeiska y ukrainska osvita – de tochy yednannia? // PERSONAL. – 2004. – № 3.
8. Zhornova O. Khudozhno-estetychne vykhovannia v konteksti kulturotvorchosti // Ridna shkola. – 1998. – № 6.
9. Korsak K.V. Svitova vyshcha osvita. Porivniannia i vyznachennia zakordonnykh kvalifikatsii i dyploviv: Monohrafiia / Za red. H.V. Shchokina. – K.: MAUP – MKA, 1997.
10. Losev A.F. Fylosofiia. Myfolohyia. Kultura. – M.: Polytyzdat, 1991. – 525 s.
11. Maslou A. Novye rubezhy chelovecheskoi pryrody. – M.: Smysl, 1999. – 425 s.
12. Naidonov I.M., Ihnatiuk A.I. Metodyka vykladannia finansovo-ekonomichnykh dystsyplin. – K., 2002.
13. Stepanyshyn B. Kulturolohichna diialnist: Navchalno-metodychnyi posibnyk. – K.: Ridna shkola, 1998.
14. Usova A.V., Bobrov A.A. Formirovanye v uchashchykhsia uchebnykh umenyi. – M.: Znanye, 1987. – 110 s.
15. Fedorchenko V.K., Minich I.M. Turystskiy slovnyk: Dovidnyk. – K.: Dnipro, 2000.
16. Tsvirova T. Rol pozashkilnykh zakladiv u protsesi vykhovannia ditei ta pidlitkiv // Ridna shkola. – 2002. – №10.
17. Shchokin R.H. Sotsialno-ekonomichnyi rozvytok // PERSONAL. – 2004. – № 2.
18. Shchukyna N.Y. Aktyvyzatsiia poznavatelnoi deiatelnosti uchashchykhsia v uchebnom protsesse. – M.: Prosveshchenye, 1975. – 160 s.

References

1. Художньо-естетичне виховання школярів у позаурочній діяльності: Програма. – К., 2002.
2. Концепція культурологічного розвитку особистості в НВК №28 м. Дніпропетровська // Мистецтво і освіта. – 2001. – №3.
3. Парламентські слухання з проблем розвитку вищої освіти // Освіта. – 2004. – № 23. – 12–19 травня
4. Андрущенко В. Модернізація вищої освіти України в контексті Болонського процесу // Освіта. – 2004. – № 23. – 12–19 травня.
5. Байденко В.И. Болонский процесс: структурная реформа высшей школы. – М.: ИЦПКПС, 2003.
6. Гинецинский В.И. Знание как категория педагогики: Опыт педагогической когнитологии. – Л.: Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1989. – 244 с.
7. Головатий М.Ф. Європейська й українська освіта – де точки єднання? // ПЕРСОНАЛ. – 2004. – № 3.
8. Жорнова О. Художньо-естетичне виховання в контексті культуротворчості // Рідна школа. – 1998. – № 6.
9. Корсак К.В. Світова вища освіта. Порівняння і визначення закордонних кваліфікацій і дипломів: Монографія / За ред. Г.В. Щокіна. – К.: МАУП – МКА, 1997.
10. Лосев А.Ф. Философия. Мифология. Культура. – М.: Политиздат, 1991. – 525 с.
11. Маслоу А. Новые рубежи человеческой природы. – М.: Смысл, 1999. – 425 с.
12. Найдонов І.М., Ігнатюк А.І. Методика викладання фінансово-економічних дисциплін. – К., 2002.
13. Степанишин Б. Культурологічна діяльність: Навчально-методичний посібник. – К.: Рідна школа, 1998.
14. Усова А.В., Бобров А.А. Формирование в учащихся учебных умений. – М.: Знание, 1987. – 110 с.
15. Федорченко В.К., Мініч І.М. Туристський словник: Довідник. – К.: Дніпро, 2000.
16. Цвірова Т. Роль позашкільних закладів у процесі виховання дітей та підлітків // Рідна школа. – 2002. – №10.
17. Щокін Р.Г. Соціально-економічний розвиток // ПЕРСОНАЛ. – 2004. – № 2.
18. Шукіна Г.И. Активизация познавательной деятельности учащихся в учебном процессе. – М.: Просвещение, 1975. – 160 с.

Губ'як В.Д., Губ'як М.В. Культурологічні «НОУ-ХАУ» в системі підготовки фахівців у вищих навчальних закладах І-ІІ рівня акредитації

Об'єктом дослідження є трансформаційні процеси в системі культурологічної освіти в історичному аспекті, оскільки до недавнього часу культурологія була частиною

антропології, археології та історії, але сьогодні концепція культури складається з усіх сфер людської діяльності, включаючи ті, які відомі як наука і система науки. Це означає, що методологічний хаос з'явився не тільки з приводу навчальної дисципліни культурології, а й з наукової на першому місці.

У статті наголошується на необхідності комплексного підходу до підготовки фахівців у процесі підготовки фахівців у вищому навчальному закладі, визначається один з найбільш ефективних шляхів вирішення цієї проблеми, тобто формування системи культурологічних навичок шляхом впровадження інтеграція культурних моделей.

Ключові слова: культурна освіта, Болонський процес, генезис, інтеграція, трансформаційний процес, етносоціальна структура, культурологія, регіональні особливості, інновації та технології.

Губьяк В.Д., Губьяк М.В., Культурологическое «НОУ-ХАУ» в системе подготовки специалистов в высших учебных заведениях I-II уровня аккредитации

Объектом исследования являются трансформационные процессы в системе культурологического образования в историческом аспекте, поскольку до недавнего времени культурология была частью антропологии, археологии и истории, но сегодня понятие культуры состоит из всех сфер человеческой деятельности, в том числе известных как наука и система науки. Это означает, что

методологический хаос возник не только в отношении учебной дисциплины культурологии, но и прежде всего в отношении научной.

В статье подчеркивается необходимость комплексного подхода к подготовке в процессе подготовки специалиста в высшем учебном заведении, выявляется один из наиболее эффективных способов решения этой проблемы, а именно формирование системы культурологических навыков путем внедрения интеграция культурных моделей.

Ключевые слова: культурное образование, Болонский процесс, генезис, интеграция, трансформационный процесс, этносоциальная структура, культурология, региональные особенности, инновации и технологии.

Губ'як Василь Дмитрович – кандидат історичних наук (доктор філософії), доцент, член НТШ, дійсний член (академік) МАБЖ, відмінник освіти України, викладач вищої категорії, методист Тербовлянського коледжу культури і мистецтв Тернопільської обл. hvasja@ukr.net
Губ'як Марія Василівна – крзнавевець, піаніст, викладач вищої категорії Тербовлянського коледжу культури і мистецтв Тернопільської обл. hvasja@ukr.net

Рецензент: д.б.н., проф. **Пилипчук О.Я.**

Стаття подана 15.03.2019.