

EDUCATION AND PEDAGOGY

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2020.6.1.1>

GENEZA PODEJŚCIA BIMODALNO-DWUJĘZYCZNEGO W EDUKACJI OSÓB NIEDOSŁYSZĄCYCH

Nataliia Adamiuk

*kandydat nauk pedagogicznych,
starszy pracownik naukowy w dziale nauczania języka migowego
Instytutu Pedagogiki Specjalnej i Psychologii imienia Mykoły Jarmaczenki
Narodowej Akademii Nauk Pedagogicznych Ukrainy (Kijów, Ukraina)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4927-6257*

Olena Drobot

*kandydat nauk pedagogicznych,
starszy pracownik naukowy w dziale nauczania języka migowego
Instytutu Pedagogiki Specjalnej i Psychologii imienia Mykoły Jarmaczenki
Narodowej Akademii Nauk Pedagogicznych Ukrainy (Kijów, Ukraina)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0762-5148
e-mail: lend7@ukr.net*

Adnotacja. Artykuł naukowy określa przesłanki pojawienia się podejścia bimodalno-dwujęzycznego w edukacji osób z zaburzeniami słuchu. Ujawniono konsekwencje mediolańskiej konferencji na temat edukacji osób niesłyszących (1880), która wpłynęła na rozwój edukacji tych osób i stanowiła podstawę podejścia monolingwalnego w kształceniu osób niesłyszących i półgłuchych. Zrozumienie metodologii komunikacyjnej edukacji osób niedosłyszących zostało ujawnione poprzez udoskonalenie specyfiki podejść monolingwalnych i bimodalno-dwujęzycznych. Przedstawiono genezę podejścia bimodalno-dwujęzycznego w edukacji studentów niesłyszących i półgłuchych, mającego na celu kształtowanie studenta jako kompetentnego dwujęzycznego bilingwa. Ujawniono treść klasyfikacji technologii bimodalno-dwujęzycznej organizacji procesu edukacyjnego dla osób niedosłyszących.

Słowa kluczowe: uczenie się bimodalno-dwujęzyczne, osoby niesłyszące i półgłuche, język migowy, podejście monolingwalne, klasyfikacja technologii, komunikacja totalna, bariery komunikacyjne.

GENESIS OF BIMODAL-BILINGUAL APPROACH IN EDUCATION OF PEOPLE WITH HEARING IMPAIRMENTS

Nataliia Adamiuk

*Ph.D. in Education,
Senior Research Fellow at the Sign Language Education Division
Mykola Yarmachenko Institute of Special Education and Psychology
of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv Ukraine)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4927-6257*

Olena Drobot

*Ph.D. in Education,
Senior Research Fellow at the Sign Language Education Division
Mykola Yarmachenko Institute of Special Education and Psychology
of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv Ukraine)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0762-5148
e-mail: lend7@ukr.net*

Abstract. The provisions of this scientific article highlight the prerequisites for the emergence of a bimodal-bilingual approach in the education of people with hearing impairments. The understanding is revealed of the communicative methodology of education of persons with hearing impairments through the specifics clarification of monolingual

and bimodal-bilingual approaches. Emphasis is placed on the fact, that the bimodal-bilingual approach in the education of deaf and hard-of-hearing learners was formed as a conceptual and methodological counterbalance to the ideas of the monolingual approach, based on the use of only spoken language as a unitary means of teaching. An idea is given of the genesis of the bimodal-bilingual approach in the education of deaf and hard-of-hearing learners, which is characterized by a gradual change of deaf education conceptual ideas, which successively passed between four stages: the original stage; the stagnation stage; the revival stage; the technological stage. It is determined, that the bimodal-bilingual approach to designing the educational environment is based on providing communicative needs and taking into account the preserved functionality of people with hearing impairments. The content is revealed of classification of technologies of bimodal-bilingual organization of educational process for persons with hearing impairments.

Key words: learners, bimodal-bilingual education, deaf and hard-of-hearing, sign language (SL), monolingual approach, simultaneous communication (SimCom), total communication technology (TC), classification of educational technologies, communication barriers.

ГЕНЕЗА БІМОДАЛЬНО-БІЛІНГВАЛЬНОГО ПІДХОДУ В ОСВІТІ ОСІБ ІЗ ПОРУШЕННЯМИ СЛУХУ

Наталія Адамюк

кандидат педагогічних наук,

старший науковий співробітник відділу навчання жестової мови

Інституту спеціальної педагогіки і психології імені Миколи Ярмаченка

Національної академії педагогічних наук України (Київ, Україна)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4927-6257

Олена Дробот

кандидат педагогічних наук,

старший науковий співробітник відділу навчання жестової мови

Інституту спеціальної педагогіки і психології імені Миколи Ярмаченка

Національної академії педагогічних наук України (Київ, Україна)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0762-5148

e-mail: lend7@ukr.net

Анотація. У положеннях наукової статті висвітлено передумови виникнення бімодально-білінгвального підходу в освіті осіб із порушеннями слуху. Розкрито наслідки Міланської конференції з освіти глухих (1880 р.), що вплинули на розвиток освіти зазначених осіб та сформували фундамент монолінгвального підходу у навчанні глухих та напівглухих осіб. Акцентовано увагу на виявлені згодом недоліки зазначеного підходу на здобуття освіти глухими та напівглухими особами. Розкрито розуміння комунікативної методології освіти осіб із порушеннями слуху через уточнення специфіки монолінгвального та бімодально-білінгвального підходів. Дано уявлення про генезу бімодально-білінгвального підходу в освіті глухих та напівглухих здобувачів освіти, що спрямована на формування здобувача освіти як компетентного бімодального білінгва. Розкрито зміст класифікації технологій бімодально-білінгвальної організації освітнього процесу для осіб із порушеннями слуху.

Ключові слова: бімодально-білінгвальне навчання, глухі та напівглухі особи, жестова мова, монолінгвальний підхід, класифікація технологій, тотальна комунікація, комунікативні бар'єри.

Introduction. For many decades, the educational process of people with hearing impairments was based on the principles of a monolingual approach. The one consisted mainly of using only spoken language as a means of learning. In some cases as a substantive means to oral speech were used separate signs of the national sign languages. Currently, the actualization of the problem of bimodal-bilingual approach in the education of people with hearing impairments is associated with changes in the requirements of domestic educational policy, in particular – provided in 2019 the *Ukrainian Sign Language status equal to the Ukrainian Spoken Language*. This determines the need to develop conceptual frameworks for designing the educational process of people with hearing impairments based on the use of two languages – Ukrainian Spoken and Sign languages.

Conceptually specific provisions of the *bimodal-bilingual approach* in contrast to the traditional monolingual approach are the design of the educational process based on the special educational needs of learners with hearing impairments and compensatory resources for their development (Hansen B., 1989: 49; Swanwick R, 2016: 2, 18).

Note that the specific of the *special educational needs* of this group of applicants arises due to the peculiarities that come out in the educational process. These difficulties are generally manifested during the process of communication between the participants in the educational process. Completely or partially impaired auditory perception of information, slow mastery of spoken language (which complicates its use as a means of teaching), low percentage of students with hearing impairments from sign language families (which leads to late learning of sign language), lack of language and methodological training of educators in higher education institutions, the prejudice of parents and professionals about sign language – all this together creates barriers to effective communication of all

participants in the educational process. This type of barriers got the name the '*communication barriers*' because it is exactly the process of communication, not language or speech. Therefore, the category of learners with hearing impairments is not attributed to persons with sensory impairments, but to persons with communication difficulties (Adamiuk N., Drobot O., Zamsha A., Fedorenko O., 2019: 38).

It is important to note, that the search for compensatory resources for comprehensive development and effective training of learners with hearing impairments in the bimodal-bilingual approach is due to the assertion of the worldview of the deaf not as 'persons with disabilities' but as a member of 'linguistic and cultural minority' (Adamiuk N., Drobot O., Zamsha A., Fedorenko O., 2018: 127).

However, the outlined provisions are conceptually new for domestic deaf educational theory and practice. Instead, the educational systems of most developed countries already have some experience and developmental history of the ideas of the bimodal-bilingual approach in education. However, today there is no systematic view on the genesis of this approach, its key turning points and the reasons, that led to the change of deaf educational ideas within this approach. Therefore, there is a need for a thorough analytical study on the stages of the genesis of the bimodal-bilingual approach in the education of people with hearing impairments.

Research methods: theoretical analysis the problem of the article, generalization and classification of developmental stages of evolution the ideas of bimodal-bilingual approach in education of hearing impairments people.

Main part. The preconditions for the emergence of the bimodal-bilingual approach were the creative search of French deaf educators of the late eighteenth century such as M. de Lepe, L. Clark, & others, who are known to have used a combination of deaf sign language and artificial methodical signs as a means of teaching children with hearing impairments. In this case, methodical signs were not analogous to the so-called traced sign language, and were used as sustentive means to indicate the features inherent in the grammar of spoken language (Swanwick R., 2016: 4, 15, 30).

However, based on the decision of the Milan Conference on the Education of the Deaf in 1880 to choose the 'oral method' as the main philosophy of education for the Deaf, the development of the ideas of bimodal-bilingual philosophy was suspended. The mentioned method is based on the provisions of the monolingual approach to education, which is expressed in the monopoly use of spoken language, especially its oral speech as a means of teaching, upbringing and development of deaf and hard-of-hearing learners (Drobot O., Zamsha A., Fedorenko O., 2017: 39, 42).

Restoration of interest in the development of ideas of the bimodal-bilingual approach dates back to the 60's of the 20th century simultaneously in several countries (Hansen B., 1989: 54; Hakuta K., 1999: 30). The reasons for this were the critically low rates of academic achievements of graduates of special schools who studied under the monolingual approach. Studies by S. P. Quigley and C. M. King show a low level of spoken language proficiency in eighteen-year-old deaf and hard-of-hearing students, which is identical to the level of eight-year-old hearing children in all types of speech (Plaza Pust C. 2005: 1850). Similar results are recorded in other countries, in particular, in Ukraine. In the monolingual approach, the educational process has a pervasive of 'remedial' orientation, and, as a consequence, the attention of teachers, instead of academic achievement, focuses on working with impaired function, which is manifested in emphasizing the learning process to correct sound pronunciation, development of auditory perception and oral speech (Adamiuk N., Drobot O., Zamsha A., Fedorenko O., 2018: 126).

It should be emphasized, that a clear feature of the monolingual approach is the constant emphasis on the dysfunction of the auditory analyzer of speech. Therefore, the slower the process of formation of sound pronunciation, development of auditory perception and oral speech, more the process of mastering the content of education by persons with hearing impairments will be delayed. The amount of 'lost' knowledge will increase, which will make it impossible to meet the requirements of educational standards and education for people with hearing impairments at the next educational level. Quite often, due to the low level of academic achievement, learners with hearing impairments are considered incapable of learning due to developmental delays. Therefore, the next illegal steps are to reduce the requirements for the level of education of deaf and hard-of-hearing people, the development of 'special' curricula that provide less knowledge of educational subjects compared to typical educational programs for secondary schools. Thus, the academic achievements of these students are directly dependent on the success of 'remedial' work on the formation of pronunciation, the development of auditory perception and oral speech, because the learning process relies on the formation of these abilities.

Also definitely a disadvantage of the monolingual approach is its discriminatory nature in relation to different groups of people with hearing impairments, as they are in unequal conditions for education (Plaza Pust C., 2005: 1848). For example, hard-of-hearing people are in much better learning conditions than those with profound hearing loss, as the ones have greater opportunities to develop auditory perception and productive oral speech (Emmorey K., Petrich J., Gollan T., 2013: 9, 10), and hence for getting education based on a monolingual approach to learning.

The centuries-old dominance of the monolingual approach is due to the belief of a number of experts that a person with hearing impairments is disabled and, therefore, deaf or hard-of-hearing must change in order to successfully adapt to society. The condition for adaptation for society is the mastery in the means of communication of hearing people. That is based on the developed ability to the productive oral speech and its auditory perception. That's why forming of these abilities is the main goal of all educational influences on the child with hearing impairments and is a fundamental problem for family and all educational institutions for this category of learners.

The aforesaid together with the results of linguistic research, which showed the full value of national sign languages as a means of communication; with the strengthening of the ideas of humanization in society, which led to

a change in views on the education of people with special educational needs, which manifested itself in abandoning the adaptation of students to the educational environment and turning to the direction of adapting the educational environment to the needs of students; with the recognition of the deaf and hard-of-hearing not as a group of people with disabilities, but as representatives of the linguistic and cultural minority – and led to the return of professionals to the idea of a bimodal-bilingual approach to education.

Thus, teachers in most developed countries have recognized that the purpose of education cannot be the formation of one competence – the acquisition of spoken language. The aim of education, for persons with hearing impairments, should be the acquirement of the competencies that make up the content of education at the appropriate level of education, using the compensatory capabilities and strengths of persons with hearing impairments.

In fact, the efforts of specialists who developed the basic provisions and technologies of the bimodal-bilingual approach were aimed at solving this issue. The effectiveness of which is evidenced by the fact, that most developed countries (Belgium, Great Britain, Holland, Estonia, Lithuania, Canada, Norway, USA, Finland, Sweden, etc.) now actively use this approach (Swanwick R, 2016: 20, 25, 30).

It is worth noting, that currently there is no single vision of the technology of bimodal-bilingual learning, as experts from different countries in parallel, but inconsistently developed practical aspects of the bimodal-bilingual approach.

One of the first attempts to develop the technology of bimodal-bilingual learning is the so-called technology of simultaneous communication (SimCom). It is in SimCom technology the deaf educators do begin to actively use signs, not just fingerspelling. However, as before, the main focus of education remained the development of oral speech and auditory perception of oral speech through the formation of the ability to ‘read’ from the lips. Educators, for the most part, used the Signs support system (as Manually Code System) for oral speech in the form of signing tracing of speech, which is based on the accompaniment of oral expressions with signs. Under such conditions, all utterances are based on the grammatical rules of verbal language. Therefore, this technology lacks a full-fledged bimodal-bilingual approach with the use of sign language as a means of learning along with spoken language (Adamiuk N., Drobot O., Zamsha A., Fedorenko O., 2018: 126, 128).

Such educational technology that based on Sign support of oral speech has had negative consequences – the formation of sign-spoken mixed, which manifested itself in difficulties in mastering deaf and hard-of-hearing students of spoken grammar by transferring to oral speech grammar of sign language, which such learners mastering much easier and faster. Thus, children with hearing impairments could not learn spoken language at a sufficient level to use it as a learning tool. This affected the level of their academic achievements and success.

At the same time, SimCom's technology has had positive consequences: educators are gradually realizing the role of Sign Language, rather than sign support for oral speech, as a means of teaching people with hearing impairments.

In fact, the bimodal-bilingual approach traditionally distinguishes two educational technologies – total communication (Denton, Holcomb, etc.) and bilingual-bicultural educating (Cummins, Carson, etc.).

Total communication technology (TC) foresees the creation of an unobstructed communicative educational environment in which all means of communication are used: oral, written, fingerspelling, natural signing, Cued Speech etc., depending on the needs and capabilities of a particular child (Hansen B., 1989: 49; Hakuta K, 1999: 42). The main criterion for selecting the means of communication is its effectiveness, speed, intelligibility for a person with hearing impairments. It should be noted, that in contrast to SimCom in TC technology as the dominant form of sign language is used the natural signing, characterized by the construction of statements according to the grammatical rules and lexis of sign language (Adamiuk N., Drobot O., Zamsha A., Fedorenko O., 2018: 125, 126).

However, TC programs, which were created and implemented by different creative groups, having a single philosophical basis and gradually unifying the name, at the same time, were technologically different. The main difference between TC programs is the different views of scientists and practitioners on the simultaneity or sequence of use of means of communication. For the most part, it is about signing and oral speech, and as a consequence, a different attitude to the place of sign language in the educational process. Some scholars do understand TC as the simultaneous use of oral and signing and even use the term ‘simultaneous communication’, which is an independent educational technology (SimCom) that is not identical to the concept of ‘total communication’. In fact, the TC technology was formed as an attempt to solve the problems that arose as a result of the implementation of SimCom. However, it is not possible to use oral speech and signing in accordance with the rules of each of the two languages (sign and spoken) at the same time. Under such conditions, the construction of utterances will be based on the laws of only one of the two languages, because otherwise there will be a mixed form of their grammatical rules. Most educators in these conditions use either tracing signing through the speech, which is based on the principles of construction of oral speech and only has signs support, or oral expressions, accompanied by individual signs. Under these conditions, people with hearing impairments need to have a high enough level of spoken language proficiency to understand this kind of utterance. However, due to the impaired functioning of the auditory perception of oral speech, they cannot independently identify the patterns inherent in each of the languages, and as a result, formed a spoken-sign mix. Therefore, people with hearing impairments cannot properly and freely use different forms of speech of two languages for communication.

In order to understand the essence of TC technology, you need to refer one of its developers. Thus, D. Denton noted that it is impossible to use two languages at the same time to ensure quality of communication, which is actually fundamental for TC. The scientist noted that the means of communication and language should be used consistently and separately. Out of the forms of sign languages, he considered the most effective means

of communication the natural language, rather than Manually Code Systems, which is more appropriate to use at later stages of educating, after students with hearing impairments mastered the basic rules of spoken language [8]. The choice of form of communication is determined solely by the capabilities of the learner, his/her level of mastering and ability to perceive a certain form of speech. In one situation, sign language can be used as the most successful mean of communication, in another – oral, in the third – written one.

In general, TC is focused on the child's mastery of all speech forms of both languages – sign and spoken, which are used as equal learning tools, including the use of oral speech as a means of learning. It should be noted, that it is traditional to distinguish two subgroups – deaf and hard-of-hearing. Deaf and hard-of-hearing people have very different communication needs and opportunities. In particular, the expediency of using oral speech as a means of education for deaf students is doubtful. This led the TC to focus on the education of only hard-of-hearing people.

For the deaf, another technology is used. It is called bilingual-bicultural educating (Swanwick R, 2016: 3, 13, 27). The specificity of this technology is that the entire volume of direct communication between the subjects of the educational process, which under normal conditions goes through oral speech, in this context, is carried out by means of natural sign language. The development of oral speech, pronunciation and hearing residues of persons with hearing impairments is carried out exclusively in remedial-and-developmental influence. This technology is characterized by the cultural orientation of the educational process, which is manifested in the formation of the identity of deaf as a representative of the culture of the Deaf and a member of hearing society at the same time.

The positive results of the introduction of the ideas of the bimodal-bilingual approach in the practical processing led to a significant increase in the level of academic achievement and social integration of learners with hearing impairments. This was the basis for recognizing the viability of this approach by UNESCO in 1985, and in 1995 it was finally recorded in the resolution of the XVIII International Conference on the Education of the Deaf.

Thus, the results of theoretical analysis (Adamiuk N., Drobot O., Zamsha A., 2018: 38, 40, 42) give grounds to state the stages of the genesis of the ideas of bimodal-bilingual approach in the education of people with hearing impairments and to distinguish the following successive stages:

1) *the original stage* is the stage of conception of sign and spoken languages as a means of educating (late eighteenth – late nineteenth century);

2) *the stagnant stage*, characterized by the decline of the idea of sign-spoken bilingualism in the education of the deaf and hard-of-hearing (late nineteenth – 60's of the twentieth century);

3) *the revival stage* of the ideas of bimodal bilingualism in the education of people with hearing impairments (60-80s of the twentieth century);

4) *the technological stage*, marked by the development and implementation of practical technologies for the implementation of bimodal-bilingual philosophy in the education of the deaf and hard-of-hearing, the development of bimodal-bilingual educational support, the development of the first teacher training programs for bimodal-bilingual programs (80s of twentieth century per today).

Note that at the current stage of the problem researching of bimodal-bilingual approach in education its methodology and practical solutions has not yet been fully described.

Conclusions. Concluding the scientific article, we briefly summarize, that:

- bimodal-bilingual approach to the design of the educational environment is based on the provision of communicative needs and taking into account the preserved functionality of people with hearing impairments;
- bimodal-bilingual approach was formed as a conceptual and methodological counterweight to the ideas of the monolingual approach, which is based on the use of only spoken language as a unitary means of educating;
- bimodal-bilingual approach is based on the use of national spoken and sign languages as a means of teaching, upbringing and development;
- the genesis of the bimodal-bilingual approach in education is characterized by a changing by stages of conceptual deaf education ideas, which successively passed between four stages: the original stage; the stagnation stage; the revival stage; the technological stage.

Bibliography:

1. Бімодальний білінгвізм: новий підхід в освіті осіб із порушеннями слуху / Н. Адамюк та ін. *Особлива дитина: навчання і виховання*. 2019. Вип. 1(90). С. 35-41. URL: <https://doi.org/10.33189/ectu.v1i90.15>.
2. До проблеми розроблення вітчизняної концепції бімодально-білінгвального підходу до навчання глухих та напівглухих / Н. Адамюк та ін. *Інноваційна педагогіка*. 2018. Вип. 7. Т. 1. С. 125–129.
3. Дробот О., Замша А., Федоренко О. Бімодально-білінгвальний підхід до організації навчання глухих та слабкочуючих. *Особлива дитина: навчання і виховання*. 2017. № 4(84). С. 37–46.
4. Emmorey K., Petrich J.A.F., Gollan T.H. Bimodal bilingualism and the frequency-lag hypothesis. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*. 2013. Vol. 18(1). P. 1–11.
5. Hakuta K. *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York : Basic Books, 1999.
6. Hansen B. *Trends in the Progress Toward Bilingual Education for Deaf Children in Denmark*, Copenhagen. Copenhagen : The Center For Total Communication, 1989.
7. Plaza Pust C. Sign Bilingual Education and Inter-modal Language Contact: On the Relation of Psycholinguistic and Pedagogical Factors in Deaf Bilingualism. *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism* (P. 1842–1854). Somerville, MA : Cascadilla Press, 2005.
8. Swanwick R. Deaf children's bimodal bilingualism and education. *Language Teaching*. 2016. Vol. 49. Issue 1. P. 1–34. DOI: 10.1017/S0261444815000348.

References:

1. Adamiuk, N., Drobot, O., Zamsha, A., Fedorenko, O. (2019). Bimodalnyi bilinhvizm: novyi pidkhid v osviti osib iz porushenniamy slukhu [Bimodal Bilingualism: a new approach to education of hearing impairment persons]. *Exceptional Child: Teaching and Upbringing*, Vol.1(90): 35-41. <https://doi.org/10.33189/ectu.v1i90.15> [in Ukrainian].
2. Adamiuk, N., Drobot, O., Zamsha, A., Fedorenko, O. (2018). До проблеми розроблення вітчизняної концепції бімодально-білінгвального підходу до навчання глухих та напівглухих [Issues to development the Ukrainian conception of bimodal-bilingual approach to education of deaf and hard-of-hearing]. *Innovative Pedagogy*, Vol.7, Issue 1: 125–129. [in Ukrainian].
3. Drobot, O., Zamsha, A., Fedorenko, O. (2017). Bimodalno-bilinhvalnyi pidkhid do orhanizatsii navchannia hlukhykh ta slabkochuiuchykh [Bimodal-Bilingual Approach in Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Education]. *Exceptional Child: Teaching and Upbringing*, Vol. 4(84): 37–46. [in Ukrainian].
4. Emmorey, K., Petrich, J.A.F., Gollan, T.H. (2013). Bimodal bilingualism and the frequency-lag hypothesis. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, Vol. 18(1): 1–11.
5. Hakuta, K. (1999). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York : Basic Books.
6. Hansen, B. (1989). *Trends in the Progress Toward Bilingual Education for Deaf Children in Denmark, Copenhagen*. Copenhagen: The Center For Total Communication.
7. Plaza Pust, C. (2005). Sign Bilingual Education and Inter-modal Language Contact: On the Relation of Psycholinguistic and Pedagogical Factors in Deaf Bilingualism. *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism* (Pp. 1842–1854). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
8. Swanwick, R. (2016). Deaf children's bimodal bilingualism and education. *Language Teaching*, Vol.49, Issue 1: 1–34 DOI: 10.1017/S0261444815000348.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2020.6.1.2>

**EKSPERYMENTALNA WERYFIKACJA TECHNOLOGII ROZWOJU KOMPETENCJI
ETNOPEDAGOGICZNYCH KIEROWNIKÓW MUZYCZNYCH INSTYTUCJI
OPIEKUŃCZO-WYCHOWAWCZYCH W OKRESIE MIĘDZYKURSOWYM
KSZTAŁCENIA PODYPLOMOWEGO**

Iryna Baikova

kierownik muzyczny

*Zakładu spółdzielczego „Instytucja Opiekuńczo-Wychowawcza (żłobek-przedszkole) nr 2
Charkowskiej Rady Miejskiej” (Charków, Ukraina)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5222-0465

baykova.i@gmail.com

Adnotacja. W artykule autor eksperymentalnie sprawdza technologię rozwoju etnopedagogicznych kompetencji kierowników muzycznych instytucji opiekuńczo-wychowawczych w okresie międzykursowym podnoszenia swoich kwalifikacji w dwóch wersjach jej realizacji (z różnym zestawem warunków pedagogicznych): pierwsza opcja – wdrożenie pierwszego i drugiego pedagogicznego warunku rozwoju kompetencji etnopedagogicznych, druga – wdrożenie wszystkich trzech pedagogicznych warunków rozwoju badanych kompetencji. Technologia obejmowała trzy etapy eksperymentu pedagogicznego: konstytutywny, formacyjny, kontrolny. Na etapie formowania w pracy naukowej i metodycznej z kierownikami muzycznymi najskuteczniejszymi formami pracy były: rejonowe (miejskie) stowarzyszenia metodyczne, warsztaty, szkolenia, seria spotkań online, trening, badania i poszukiwania, działania samokształceniowe, działania metodyczne w formacie interaktywnego klubu, a także interaktywne, metody gry – breystroming, dyskusja, gry pedagogiczne i ćwiczenia symulacyjne, gry biznesowe, metody wpływu emocjonalnego, nasycenia informacji, mające na celu kompleksowy rozwój wszystkich składników badanych kompetencji pedagoga-muzyka. Analiza wyników badań eksperymentalnych wykazała skuteczność opracowanej technologii pedagogicznej i stwierdziła, że najbardziej skuteczną jest kompleksowa realizacja wszystkich trzech warunków pedagogicznych jednocześnie: 1) wsparcie psychologiczno-pedagogiczne i stymulacja nauczyciela-muzyka ze strony administracji instytucji opiekuńczo-wychowawczych w dziedzinie aktywności zawodowej, mające na celu etnopedagogizację procesu rozwoju muzycznego przedszkolaków; 2) różnorodność form, wdrażanie metod badawczych i interaktywnych naukowo-metodycznej pracy kierownika muzycznego, wypełnionych treścią etnopedagogiczną; 3) stworzenie dla kierowników muzycznych środowiska edukacyjnego komunikacji międzykulturowej, zorganizowanie interakcji tej kategorii nauczycieli z nosicielami różnych etnokultur, przedstawicielami organizacji społecznych mniejszości narodowych – w formacie interaktywnego klubu „Kalejdoskop Etnokultur”.

Słowa kluczowe: technologia, kierownik muzyczny, warunki pedagogiczne, kompetencje etnopedagogiczne, podyplomowe kształcenie pedagogiczne, klub interaktywny.