

профессиональной подготовки социального педагога через сетевые профессиональные сообщества. Проанализировано позиции ведущих ученых по поводу профессиональной подготовки будущих социальных педагогов и применения виртуального пространства в учебной деятельности, определено сервисы, при помощи которых возможна оптимизация образовательного процесса.

Ключевые слова: Интернет, социальные сети, социальный педагог, виртуальное пространство, профессиональная подготовка, профессиональное общение, виртуальная образовательная среда.

Summary. Marina Hrinchenko. Value virtual space in the training of future social workers. *The publication highlights the use of virtual space in the training of future social workers, in particular analyzed the role of Internet in obtaining and disseminating information, the possibility of distance education and counseling, creating events and attraction to the public, the importance of social networks in professional communication. The necessity of optimizing the training of social pedagogy through professional networking community.*

Analyzed the position of the leading scientists for training future social workers and the use of virtual space in educational activities, services defined by which is possible to optimize the educational process. The article deals with the concept of training, determined the content of the definition of «social pedagogy training»; are possible forms of forms of students and teachers in the virtual space: distance learning within the community; communication forums, chat rooms, create web pages and websites; highlights the potential for creating a virtual learning environment-based universities. Also singled out the positive and negative aspects of creating a virtual learning environment, the necessity of the introduction of «virtual education» in the training of future social workers.

Keywords: *Internet, social networking, social educator, virtual space, training, professional communication, virtual learning environment.*

УДК 378. 147:658

Dimitrina Kamenova, Viktoria Gedinach

DIALOGICAL MODEL OF TEACHING STUDENTS IN MANAGEMENT

The report presents research on the model of dialogical interaction, model of teaching students in management, based on dialogue. The investigation reveals the consecutive stages of the model introduction to practice. There are presented the results of the first stage of the didactic experiment that aims to investigate the change the students' attitude towards the dialogical forms and methods of communication in management (especially in teaching management). The results indicate the necessity of the dialogical competence development for managers as a tool of their transformation into leaders. The study of the most commonly used methods and replica-techniques in the teaching of students in Management reveals the necessity of putting the dialogue in the center of didactic interaction as a tool to change the thinking, emotions and behavior of trainees, as well as their trainers in reciprocal dialogism. The results obtained can be the basis for the construction a taxonomic system of skills for using and analysis of the managerial discourse – the skill of the manager to create speech that will be adequate for the situation in his rational and emotional variations.

Keywords: *model of dialogical interaction, dialogical model of teaching, dialogical forms and methods of teaching, transformation managers into leaders.*

Problem definition. The model of teaching students in management is based on the investigation of the dialogical interaction resources that is interpreted by the authors as a new value different from the ordinary talk or conversation. At a time when every self-respecting pedagogue is directed to ensure interaction between two main subjects of the training (trainer and trainee) the teaching process can be measured only by the achievement of development [1] as a gradual change of knowledge, skills and abilities of individual [13]. Therefore the

value of the model based on dialogue is rationalized by verification the theoretical statements about it both in the management and in the pedagogical interaction as a toll for implementing the transition from innovative thinking → intellectual development of the dialogue participants → development of the organization (course, group). On the second plan, the dialogical competence developed through a dialogue [8] plays a role of a tool for the manager (including for the coach as the leader of the lesson with teenagers or adults for the development of a successful person. On the third plan checking the model of dialogic interaction points to two areas – management and pedagogy [8].

Recent studies and publications analysis. The problem of dialogue involved scientists from ancient times. But the «return» to the resources of dialogue in philosophy due to the work of researchers such as M. Haydeger, Yu. Habermas, K. Apel and many others. other (philosophy) F. de Saussure, U. Eco, Kristeva, R. Barthes, P. Ricoeur and others. (in modern linguistics and semiology), A. N. Leontiev, L. Vygotsky – in the psychological dimensions of communication, M. Foucault and others. (in mostmodernata epistemology). Resource technological context of dialogue given the achievements of authors such as Schleiermacher, Husserl, Heidegger, Gadamer, Habermas, Apel, Ricoeur, etc., But in terms of the pragmatics of discourse (individual statement) - Van Dyke, Petofi, Brown M. L. Makarov and many others. In the theory of the speech act (J. Austin Dzh. Sarl, Grice, Goffman) of speech activity, ethnography of speech (D. Hayms, Bauman, Gamparts etc.) In ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, Maynard, Sikoral and others.) in functional linguistics (M. Halidey etc.) is considered that a series of grammatical well-constructed sentences do not always guarantee a successful act of communication. According M. Halidey one of the objectives of the discourse is to show how knowledge of the rules for connecting and linking sentences in context appears as a necessary condition for full communion. Interest in the problems of pedagogical dialogue of the authors continued nearly two decades.

Object of an article. Research on the model of dialogical interaction, model of teaching students in management, based on dialogue.

Explanation. The dialogue as a phenomenon in the context of this study is the intersection point between two areas – pedagogics and management. This allows its modeling for educational purposes, as well as a resource for such important at the present stage transformation from management into leadership [7] requiring not only obedience to the manager, but willingly following a leader with a view to individual and organizational success.

1. Model of dialogical interaction

The study of the theoretical formulation of the dialogue as a philosophical, linguistic, socio-psychological and discursive category are predetermined as components of the model of dialogical interaction, that ensures development, respectively to adopt motivation, orientation and participation (through productive speech) in the dialogue. Hence it might be assumed that if the pattern of manager's speech (discourse) by parameters:

to function – which means the manager to construct his speech in such a way that to cause a **change and development** 1) of his collaborator towards the product that he produces, 2) towards himself by means of new knowledge, skills (competencies) and hence 3) of the organization it which they work. This first stage of dialogical motivating secures the organization as a self-developing system (not as bureaucratic or self-regulatory through rules);

to orient – what and in that manner collaborator or collaborators to achieve in order to fulfil the development in three indicated areas – product (service), person, organization. The dialogue in management rationalizes “attendance” of a collaborator as a functioning (success), as a maintaining of the interaction and as a social engaging in a success of the organization. Thus the dialogical principle founds the development of product, human and manager himself keeping at gunpoint the development of the whole organization. It expresses the deep culturological meaning of the model – not only a thought about yourself (the concrete

implementation of the own tasks and timetable within the organization), but a thought about to what extent those things that one person produces, resonates in the success of others and in organizational success as well – **the orientational stage**;

to produce – to create a new meaning through the dialogue, once more at three levels:

- «know-how» introduction into the product as a continuously innovative subject;
 - to co-operate for developing the knowledge, skills and experience of Others (as continuously prospering);
 - to contribute to the development of the organization through their achievements,
- it would have made the transition from innovative thinking → intellectual development of the dialogue participants → development of the organization (course, group).

Individual achievement is usually «hidden», because it is personal. After receiving a recognition from the organization or from Others (outside the organization) it becomes a success – at the level of the **executive stage**.

2. Model of teaching based on dialogue

The educational model as one technological option of teaching based on the didactic dialogue follows the same operational logic: **to function** – motivation stage: aims to create an attitude towards dialogical type of communication that ensures development of individuals; **to orient** – orientational stage: it aims to show a direction of what and how will be accomplished by activation of individual structures of thought of both speaking subjects – trainers and trainees; **to produce** – to report and measure educational results, based on dialogical principle.

Methods of investigation. The introduction of the dialogical teaching model is carried out by didactic experiment with students from International University College (IUC) in the period of last three years in «Marketing and Management», «Hotel Management» and «Marketing and Management of Hospitality and Tourism». Didactic experiment pursues several **objectives**: 1. To prove or reject the hypothesis concerning the necessity to develop dialogical competence of the manager. 2. To prove or reject the *hypothesis* concerning the necessity to construct the model of dialogical interaction in management (particularly in education in Management Programs). 3. To verify or reject the hypothesis concerning the applicability or usefulness of the model of dialogical competence for educational purposes (i. e. to what extent the model plays the role of a standard for the development of dialogical skills in teaching conditions).

Results of putting the model into practice. The first stage of the experiment introduction is carried out before the students in Management participate in activities related to the managerial dialogue. Due to lack of time and place, there are presented some results from the first stage connected with the study of the students' attitude towards dialogue as a form of interaction. This method aims to identify their initial attitude and knowledge about dialogue at all, as different one from ordinary conversation. For determining their attitude is used the questionnaire method as a first phase at the end of the first semester of the first year, after the students have already trained in three modules in Management. The students were given a questionnaire by which to rank the various methods and techniques applied by teachers at IUC. The purpose of the use of this questionnaire is to draw the students' attention to teaching methodology in order to identify the effectiveness of dialogical model later in managerial practice itself.

The questionnaire, used during the first stage, includes only one task: *Please range on a frequency principle the disciplines in Management that are used by IUC lecturers – place number in front of undermentioned disciplines (1 – the most commonly used method, 2 – frequently used and so on)*. The list consists of different methods of dialogical interaction and monologue. It should be clarified that among the methods are deliberately placed dialogical techniques as well as different speech genres in order to verify that the students are sensitive

to the dialogical approach in teaching and are able to differ dialogical form of expression from monological. The results of the survey are shown in table 1:

Table 1

Range of teaching methods and techniques

№	Method/dialogical technique	№	Method/dialogical technique
11	lecture (explanation)	221	listens carefully
22	greet	222	sermon (gives advises unnecessarily)
23	explains	23	organizes debates
44	creates teams by attraction	224	replica-reproach
55	delegates tasks	225	inspiring replica
66	comments	226	manipulative replica
77	replica-assessment	227	presents managerial cases
88	presentation	228	stages a game (everybody has his/her own role)
99	mentoring replica	229	ironic replica
110	controlling replica (monitoring)	330	mediates between people and teams
111	gives instructions	331	summons a meeting
112	explains the group decision-making	332	tells stories
113	coordinates the interaction between people and teams	333	states emotions (expresses an opinion)
114	convincing replica	334	discussion of problems
115	gives examples by telling stories	335	address (speech)
116	interpretation of facts	336	funny stories (anecdotes)
117	carries out the training	337	confrontational replica (creates conflict)
818	creates a network of the followers	338	roundtable
919	interview (explores)	339	joke
220	facilitates the tasks implementation	440	command

The submitted list is subject to an additional ranking in the second phase of the survey (for the third year students) towards: 1) frequency of the methods of teaching and 2) dialogical techniques. Among a total of sixteen dialogical method of training that reveal surveyed third year students in Management, most commonly used are lecture, interpretation and presentation – all from the group of the exhibition, occupying the first three positions. The method «Talk» is ranked at position 4. The most «dialogical» methods are ranked at considerably more distant positions: debate – position 9, discussion – position 13. The interactive methods as *game*, *training* respectively are at the seventh and eleventh place. The outlined picture shows that, although the tasks posed by teachers are primarily related to the self-development of projects as a policy IUC (students put this method at the twelfth position), the training itself is not held in the form of dialogical interaction. Probably because of repetitive type of tasks, students do not differ the specifics of the teaching module in it and therefore face difficulties while constructing their own attitude to the changeability towards the respective competence. This explains the ranking of “assign the tasks-conflict” at the sixteenth position. Generally the «implementation» of the conflict into the education by lecturer means forecasting, design and putting in such learning situations which ensure collision with the new (in this case – educational content such as knowledge and skills, roles, etc.). In the conflict-logical literature this is defined as «cognitive conflict» [6, p. 89]. Another fact outlining the need to introduce a training into the model of dialogical interaction is the respondents’ ranking of «case studies» method at the tenth of the 16 positions. The common methodological picture seems quite unbiased – on the one hand, tasks requiring individual project activity do not «play» essential role for their routines. On the other hand, the fragment

of reality itself is not issued which must be compulsory studied (according to the Module Program chosen by students) – Management. By a third party, there are not asked real situations from practice to provide a basis for discussion, debate or consideration with a view to seeking truth which is transformed into knowledge within these activities.

The second essential stage of the training in form of dialogue aims *the change of some determined attitudes towards real participation in didactic (managerial) dialogue*. The results of this phase will probably be presented elsewhere and at other times in the form of didactic fragments. In terms of content they are related to the subjects for the third year students in Management. It is necessary to clarify that the choice of subjects, on the one hand, is related to the fact that they should be in the field of management, second – functionally to prepare students in dialogical relation to the human in the organization, and third – to be a target activity of the researchers-lecturers. Fragments follow a logical transformation transition: *untrained non dialogical manager – dialogical manager – dialogical leader*. In each fragment of the training can be found the logic of the construct: dialogical model of training in its three stages: motivational, indicative and executive. By the implementation of this model into the workshops with the students of IUC their attention is focused on the difference between both dialogical and monologic forms and methods of communication, as well as into effect of their application - first in education. The next element highlighted in the subjects of Management is discussion about the possibility some of dialogical forms and methods to be used in managerial practice with priority: 1) as dialogical tools (provided by managers) for development of the individual in communication with collaborators, i. e. customers, partners and competitors; 2) towards different situations in management – the students specify the following activities: *human resources selection; staff training; tasking (command, orders, rules); control; holding meetings; employees performance appraisal; negotiations (transactions)*. It is noteworthy that the evaluation as a function is ranked at one of the last places and the decision making (excluding the holding of a meeting) is totally missing in the repertoire of their answers. Students consistently highlighted the difference between «order» and actual mental movement as *a change in mental-cognitive structure* through the dialogue as a different model of speaking. The third stage as a final one is again a survey which main purpose is to establish the change and the students' willingness to implement the dialogical approach into the managerial activity

Conclusions. The study of the most commonly used methods and replica-techniques in the teaching of students in Management reveals: 1) the necessity of putting the dialogue in the center of didactic interaction as a tool to change the thinking, emotions and behavior of trainees, as well as their trainers in reciprocal dialogism; 2) the opportunity to emphasize the resources of internal dialogue as an insurer of conversion the information into personalized knowledge; 3) certain parameters of the training model structure based on dialogue. These results of the investigation prepare the model to be approbated which would enable to create the dialogue management model in education. The results obtained can be the basis for the construction a taxonomic system of skills for using and analysis of the managerial discourse – the skill of the manager to create speech that will be adequate for the situation in his rational and emotional variations. Its abundance would significantly facilitate successful manager – a leader in his work.

References

1. Белова М. Теоретични основи на възпитанието / М. Белова, Н. Бояджиева, Г. Димитрова, К. Сапунджиева. – С. : Веда Словена – ЖГ, 1997.
2. Библер В. С. Что есть философия? // Вопросы философии. – 1995. – № 1. – С. 159 – 183.
3. Варанов А. Н. Языковое взаимодействие в диалоге и понятие иллюкативного вынуждения / А. Н. Варанов, И. М. Крейдлин // Вопросы языкознания. 1992. – № 2. – С. 84 – 85.
4. Демьянков В. З. Тайна диалога. (Введение) / В. З. Демьянков // Диалог: теоретические проблемы и методы исследования. – М. : ИНИ-ОН РАН, 1992. – С. 10 – 44.

5. Дракър П. Менеджмънт на бъдещето / П. Дракър. – Карива, Варна, 1998. – 115 с.
6. Каменова Д. Конфликтологична компетентност на мениджъра : монография / Д. Каменова. – Албена : Изд-во ВУМК. 2011. – 350 с.
7. Каменова Д. Как се става лидер? Ръководство за самообучение / Д. Каменова. – Добрич : Изд-во Нилекта. 2012. – 22 с.
8. Каменова Д. Диалогика на мениджмънта : монография / Д. Каменова. – Албена : Изд-во на ВУМК, 2014. – 175 с.
9. Крейнър С. Теоретиците, които промениха света на мениджмънта / С. Крейнър. – С. : ИК „ИнфоДАР“, 2008. – 200 с.
10. Макаров М. Л. Основы теории дискурса / М. Л. Макаров. – М. : ИТДК «Гнозис», 2003. – 225 с.
11. Попов В. В. Теория рациональности: неклассический и постнеклассический подходы : учеб. Пособие / В. В. Попов, Б. С. Щеглов. – Ростов н/Д. : Изд-во Ростов. ун-та (в авторской редакции), 2006. – 242 с.
12. Степин В. С. Саморазвивающиеся системы и постнеклассическая рациональность / В. С. Степин // Вопросы философии. – 2003. – № 8. – С. 5 – 17.
13. Стефанова М. Педагогическата инновация / М. Стефанова. – С. : Петекстон. 2005. – 525 с.
14. Bunt H. Context and Dialogue Control / Harry Bunt. – 1994. – С. 1 – 16 [Electronic resource]. – Access : <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.39.1926&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
15. Bunt H. Dialogue pragmatics and context specification / Harry Bunt. – 1994. – С. 81 – 150. – Access : <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.23.2949&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
16. Burton F. Official Discourse: On Discourse Analysis, Government Publications, Ideology and the State / F. Burton, P. Carlen. – London : Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979. – 150 s.
17. Carlson L. Dialogue Games : An Approach to Discourse Analysis / L. Carlson. – Boston : Reidel, 1983. – 212 s.
18. Cronen V. E. The meaning of «meaning» in CMM analyses of communication: A comparison of theories / V. E. Cronen, W. B. Pearce, C. XI // Research on Language and Social Interaction. – 1990. – Vol. 25. – P. 37 – 66.
19. Cushman D. Human communication: A rules perspective / D. Cushman, B. Kovacic ; in ed. F. L. Casmir // Building communication theories: A socio/cultural approach. – Hillsdale, NJ. : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1994. – P. 269 – 295.
20. Dant T. Knowledge, Ideology, and Discourse: A Sociological Perspective / Tim Dant. – London : Routledge, 1991. – 236 p.
21. Denzin N. K. Symbolic interactionism / N. K. Denzin // Rethinking Psychology. – London : Sage Publication, 1995. – P. 43 – 58.
22. Dijk T. A. van. The study of discourse / van Dijk T. A. // Discourse as Structure and Process / in ed. van Dijk T. A. – London : Sage Publication. – 1997. – Vol. 1. – P. 1 – 34.
23. Dijk T. A. van. Discourse as Social Interaction / van Dijk T. A. – London : Sage Publication, 1997. – Vol. 2. – P. 1 – 37.
24. Hanks W. F. Language and Communicative Practicies / W. F. Hanks. – Boulder, Colorado : Westview Press, 1996. – 179 s.
25. Harré R. The Discursive Mind / R. Harré, G. Gillett. – Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage Publication, 1994. – 269 s.
26. Jucker A. H. Conversation: structure or process / A. H. Jucker // Searle J. R. Searle on Conversation / J. R. Searle et al. – Amsterdam, 1992. – P. 77 – 90.
27. Labov W. Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation / W. Labov, D. Fanshel. – New York : Academic Press, 1977. – 320 s.
28. Lakoff R. T. Talking Power: The Politics of Language / R. T. Lakoff. – New York : Basic Books, 1990. – 250 s.
29. Meskon M. H. Management / M. H. Meskon, M. Albert, F. K. Khedouri. – [3-rd ed.]. – New York : Harper& Row Publishers, 1999. – 175 s.
30. Potter J. Discourse analysis / J. Potter, M. Wetherell ; in ed. J. A. Smith // Rethinking Methods in Psychology. – London : Sage Publication, 1995. – P. 80 – 92.
31. Sacks H. Lectures on Conversation / H. Sacks ; in ed. G. Jefferson. – [2-nd ed.]. – Oxford : Blackwell. – Vols. 1–2. – 1995.
32. Библер В. С. Диалог и диалогика : доклад от 22. 5. [Электронный ресурс] / В. С. Библер. – 1997 // Библер и вокруг : философское сообщество. – Режим доступа : http://www.bibler.ru/bid_dialog.htm/

*Одержано редакцією 17.11.2014
Прийнято до публікації 25.11.2014*

Анотація. Дімітріна Каменова, Вікторія Гедінач. **Діалогічна модель навчання студентів в сфері менеджменту.** Стаття містить дослідження моделі діалогічних взаємодій студентів, які навчаються за професією «менеджер». Дослідження виявляє послідовні етапи впровадження моделі на практиці. А також представлено результати першого етапу дидактичного експерименту, метою якого є перевірка зміни ставлення студентів до діалогічних форм і методів комунікації в управлінні, а саме – у навчанні менеджменту. Результати вказують на необхідність розвитку діалогічної компетенції менеджера як інструменту для його перетворення на лідера.

Ключові слова: модель діалогічних взаємодій, діалогічна модель навчання, діалогічні форми і методи навчання, перетворення менеджера у лідера.

Аннотация. Димитрина Каменова, Виктория Гединач. **Диалогическая модель обучения студентов в сфере менеджмента.** Статья содержит исследование модели диалогических взаимодействий студентов, обучающихся по профессии «менеджер». Исследование обнаруживает последовательные этапы внедрения модели на практике. А также представлены результаты первого этапа дидактического эксперимента, целью которого является проверка изменения отношения студентов к диалогическим формам и методам коммуникации в управлении, а именно – в обучении менеджменту. Результаты указывают на необходимость развития диалогической компетенции менеджера как инструмента для его превращения в лидера.

Ключевые слова: модель диалогических взаимодействий, диалогическая модель обучения, диалогические формы и методы обучения, преобразования менеджера в лидера.

УДК 159. 153

Н. В. Карпенко

ПРОФЕСІОНАЛІЗМ ТА ПРОФЕСІЙНІ СТРАХИ ОСОБИСТОСТІ

У статті розглядається проблема професіоналізму та професійних страхів особистостей зрілого віку, аналізуються джерела зародження професійних страхів та детермінанти їх виникнення, подано рекомендації для профілактики професійних страхів та їх подолання у процесі становлення професіоналізму особистості.

Ключові слова: становлення професіоналізму, професійні страхи, джерела зародження професійного страху, детермінанти виникнення професійних страхів, профілактика професійних страхів.

Постановка проблеми. Професіоналами у своїй сфері діяльності здатні стати, як правило, люди з обдарованістю, що відповідає запитам цієї сфери. Природна обдарованість людини передбачає більш витончену та високоорганізовану психіку, яка проявляє особливу чутливість до явищ життя, дає глибокий яскравий відгук на впливи, але через вразливість підвладна формуванню детермінант і механізмів різних видів страху, від чого часто потерпають творчі особистості, що безумовно впливає на формування професіоналізму.

Мета статті. Необхідно розглянути можливі професійні страхи, що можуть стати на заваді становленню професіоналізму та профілактику і подолання страху в процесі професійного зростання.

Виклад основного матеріалу дослідження. Види професійних страхів тісно пов'язані з джерелами, що їх породжують.

Перше можливе джерело професійних страхів – надто малі права і надто велика відповідальність за результати діяльності. У цьому випадку причина незадоволеності полягає у тому, що неможливо діяти за власним розумінням та втілювати в життя власні ідеї. Отже, у людини виникає відчуття малоприсади, їй доводиться почувати себе в тісних рамках, що заважає становленню професіоналізму фахівця. Надмірна