

9. Wahl A., Kongsvik T. Підготовка кадрів з управління ресурсами в морській галузі : огляд літератури. *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*. 2018. № 17 (3). P. 377–396.
10. Zavalnyuk O. A key component of continuing professional development in the maritime context. *Seas of Transition : Setting a Course for the Future*. 2021. P. 19.

References:

1. Salnikov O., Kozlova L. (2020). *Realizaciya koncepciyi navchannya protyagom zhyttya v upravlinni personalom na publichnij sluzhbi : deyaki teoretichni aspekti* [Implementation of the concept of life course learning in personnel management in the public service: some theoretical aspects]. № 10. S. 1092–1105 [in Ukrainian].
2. Semenyuk N. (2012) *Nepererвна osvita : svitova praktyka ta Ukrayina* [Continuous education: world practice and Ukraine]. *Visha osvita Ukrayini*. № 4. S. 100–105 [in Ukrainian].
3. Dukic G. (2023). Managers and lifelong learning : an analysis of motivation and motivational factors. *Management. Journal of Modern Management Problems*. № 28 (2). P. 57–71
4. European Commission. European report on quality indicators of lifelong learning. Brussels (2002). *Directorate-General of Education and Culture*. 95 p.
5. Madaleno B. (2017). The role of sustainability in maritime technical management (Master's thesis, University College of South-east Norway)
6. SUNY Maritime College. (n.d.). Executive summary : SUNY Maritime College. URL : <https://www.sunymaritime.edu/about/strategic-planning/executive-summary>. technology. (n.d.)
7. Letter L Teaching Terms (2021). *Terms in teaching that start with letter*. URL : <https://www.teach-nology.com/glossary/terms/l/>
8. The European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning (2001). *Education and Culture*. 2001. P. 3.
9. Wahl A., Kongsvik T. (2018). Pidgotovka kadriv z upravlinnya resursami v morskij galuzi : oglyad literaturi. *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*. № 17 (3). P. 377–396.
10. Zavalnyuk O. (2021) A key component of continuing professional development in the maritime context. *Seas of Transition : Setting a Course for the Future*. P. 19.

Avramenko O., Makarenko L. Increasing the level of technical culture of managers of the maritime industry in the conditions of continuous education

The article analyzes the concept of "continuous education", defines its main features, analyzes the methods that will allow to increase the level of technical culture of managers of the maritime industry in the conditions of continuous education. It is noted that the rapid and dynamic development of the maritime industry, the technical modernization of ships, as well as the constant increase in requirements for shipowners in terms of environmental protection and cyber security put future specialists in the maritime industry in conditions of constant search for new approaches in the training process. The concept of "lifelong education" goes beyond traditional educational institutions and encompasses various forms of learning: formal, non-formal and informal. It can be both acquiring new knowledge in institutions of higher education, and self-education, participation in trainings, workshops, online courses, etc. The main goal of such training is the constant improvement of the personality and the increase of competitiveness in the labor market.

It has been established that managers of the maritime industry are faced with a large number of complex tasks related to the operation of vessels, logistics, international maritime law, maritime safety and other aspects. In order to successfully solve these tasks, deep knowledge and practical skills are necessary, which are constantly changing and being supplemented. Continuing education is the only way to ensure the relevance of managers' knowledge and their readiness for new challenges and should become an integral part of managers' professional development, ensuring their competitiveness on the labor market.

In the course of the research, a systematic analysis of domestic and foreign psychological and pedagogical literature was carried out, scientific articles, monographs and dissertations related to the researched topic were analyzed. Using the method of content analysis, key concepts, theoretical approaches and empirical data were identified, which formed the basis of the study.

Key words: maritime industry, maritime industry managers, continuous education, educational process, innovations, technical culture.

УДК 371.3:811.111

DOI <https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series5.2024.100.02>

Baksha R., Husti I., Kacsur A.

DIFFERENTIATION IN THE PROCESS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

This article explores the intricate complexities and fundamental necessity of differentiation in language instruction, particularly within the multifaceted context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching. Acknowledging that learners are far from a homogeneous group, but rather exhibit an impressive spectrum of diverse backgrounds, abilities, and motivations, the study critically examines the conventional educational model that imposes uniformity while neglecting individual learner differences. The concept of a "general learner" is argued to be a misleading fallacy that inadequately addresses the unique and varied needs of each student. The article underscores the importance of innovative, tailored teaching strategies that are responsive to these differences, thereby enabling learners to progress at their own pace and according to their learning styles.

Through an extensive review of the existing literature, the study examines the pivotal role of differentiation as an essential approach in language teaching. It highlights how differentiation can enhance motivation, critical thinking, and overall language proficiency among students. The article deals with various influential factors – such as age, gender, personality traits, and learning styles-that significantly impact language learning outcomes. The authors advocate for a paradigm shift in EFL instruction, emphasizing the critical need for educators to adopt highly flexible and adaptive teaching methods. This shift necessitates the thoughtful modification of lesson plans, the creative employment of a wide range of teaching activities, and the deliberate fostering of an inclusive and supportive learning environment. Ultimately, the authors earnestly call for ongoing, reflective dialogue among educators to share valuable experiences and progressively refine pedagogical practices, thereby ensuring that the diverse and complex needs of all learners are adequately met in increasingly varied and dynamic classrooms.

Key words: *differentiation, differentiated instruction, English as a foreign language teaching, heterogeneous classroom, individual learner variables, learner differences, method of differentiating, motivation.*

(статтю подано мовою оригіналу)

It is widely acknowledged that every individual is unique, which is why not all language learners are alike. They do not merely represent a homogeneous group of people with identical backgrounds and abilities; rather, they exhibit a spectrum of differences.

To facilitate language learners in making substantial progress towards mastering their chosen language, teachers must consider various factors. Unfortunately, many education systems around the world are deficient in this regard. Hence, researching, self-educating, and immersing oneself in relevant literature become imperative for prospective teachers, particularly those specializing in foreign languages. After all, where else can one encounter a more diverse group of individuals in terms of age, gender, motivation, and shared language learning objectives?

This paper aims to delineate the aspects that describe a group of learners, highlighting the areas of divergence among individuals. It investigates how recognizing and utilizing individual learner differences can improve language learning outcomes and guide learners with diverse backgrounds towards the common goal of achieving confident language proficiency and usage, as well as foster effective communication skills in all students.

Differentiation is a pedagogical strategy that tailors instruction to meet the diverse needs of individual learners [15]. By providing opportunities for creative expression and cognitive engagement, differentiation can enhance student motivation and critical thinking skills [1]. To effectively implement differentiation, it is crucial to consider students' psychological profiles. Ultimately, the goal of differentiation is to cultivate well-rounded, independent individuals capable of lifelong learning and effective communication [11].

Differences among Language Learners. Most teachers often have a global view of a class of students and assess them against an imaginary norm, but this norm is never defined by anyone and is not based on the individual abilities of each student. This is why language teaching is not as effective as it could be, and it does not help students to realise and use their true potential. Teachers need to take into account that every classroom is filled with students with different interests, skills and abilities, and therefore a non-existent, imaginary average learner can no longer be the model for language teaching [3].

Along with the rise of the lingua franca of English, the increase in the number of non-native English speakers and the attempt to recognise different varieties of English, the so-called World Englishes, not to mention the rise of migration and globalisation, the field of English language teaching (ELT) has become extremely diverse. English classes, like other classes, are attended by students from a variety of linguistic, educational, socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. Every day, teachers are challenged by the diversity of their classrooms, especially its increase. In the face of these and similar factors, teachers need to develop strategies to support them on an ongoing basis in effectively facilitating the language learning experiences of diverse groups of learners. This is underpinned by the one-size-fits-all approach favoured by textbooks, supplementary materials and educational technologies that seek to cover a wider market [12].

People differ from each other in a number of biological, conditioned (influenced by nature) or unconscious forces (influenced by past experiences). There are differences that are easily learned through common interactions but individual differences are learned through rigorous research. The differences that can be studied are: age, sex, aptitude, motivation, learning styles, learning strategies, and personality. The most common differences of learners are: gender, age, intelligence, ability, interest, prior knowledge, learning style, motivation, locus of control, self-efficacy, and epistemological beliefs.

These differences are closely interlinked and together they play an important role in language learning. In many cases, these non-linguistic factors are not given much attention in research on language learning alongside linguistic factors [12].

Ortega, Cabrera and Benalcázar [9] consider the following as important aspects that teachers should pay attention to: recognition of learners' different backgrounds, languages, cultures, readiness, learning preferences, interests, needs and learning profiles. For instance, numerous empirical studies indicate that women differ from men in their use of language learning strategies, with women generally employing more strategies than men, although this is not always the case.

It is important to consider that language learners bring their individual personality traits into the learning process, which can either facilitate or hinder successful foreign language acquisition. Certain personality characteristics have been noted to influence the efficacy of language learning:

1. Self-esteem, representing one's sense of self-worth;
2. Extroversion or introversion: Extroverts tend to exhibit better short-term memory, greater stress resilience, and lower anxiety levels during foreign language production compared to introverts;
3. Risk-taking: Students inclined towards risk-taking typically demonstrate higher levels of engagement in language classrooms;
4. Inhibition;
5. Tolerance of ambiguity, which positively impacts listening comprehension.

Foreign language learners vary in their learning styles, often categorized as analytic or global. Analytic learners are meticulous rule followers who prioritize accuracy and rule comprehension. On the other hand, global learners focus less on intricate language details and tend to communicate more fluently than their analytic counterparts.

Differentiation in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Ortega, Cabrera and Benalcázar [9, p. 1220] state that 'differentiated instruction (DI) is an instructional strategy intended to help educators succeed their diverse student population along the process of teaching and learning'.

It matters how we approach students and how we encourage them to learn English. English as a Foreign Language is learning and teaching English in a non-English-speaking country. Students learning English in Ukraine, for example, are considered EFL students because English is not the official language of the country. However, if these same learners were studying English in the United States, they would be considered as ESL learners.

The concept of differentiation can be interpreted broadly, but it seems to be a definite necessity in order to recognise and meet the needs of all learners. Every learner has the right to have this done, and it is the teacher's responsibility to find effective ways of addressing the needs and abilities of the students, and to adapt these methods to the curriculum with appropriate learning and teaching styles. This is where differentiation plays a vital role [2].

Differentiation means planning according to the differences of the learners. It also means recognising that students differ in the quality and speed of their learning. Differentiation requires flexibility and adaptability in responding to what to teach and how to teach questions according to learners' needs [7].

According to Mills, Monk, Keddie, Renshaw, Christie, Geelan, and Gowlett [8], differentiation is a process whereby teachers provide opportunities for learners to work at their own pace and to develop their potential through a variety of relevant learning activities. Reese [13] refers to Carol Ann Tomlinson [23], who has written a book called *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners*, in which she explains that in differentiated classrooms the teacher does not start teaching where the curriculum begins, but where the students are. These teachers accept and build on the fact that learners differ in essential ways, and at the same time they take as a basic premise that teachers must be prepared to engage learners through different ways of learning, by drawing on different interest and by using different paces and degrees of complexity of instruction in the development [13].

In their collaborative article, Ortega, Cabrera and Benalcázar [9] refer back to the work of Heacox [6], who has the opinion that the Differentiated Instruction (DI) is not an educational strategy, but an approach to teaching and learning that seeks to maximise the development and individual success of each learner by adapting or modifying content, process and product. It aims to meet each student in the learning process [9].

Ortega, Cabrera, Benalcázar [9] also drew on the ideas of Pham [10] in defining differentiation as an approach that involves identifying learners' levels of readiness, modifying instruction, using collaboration and autonomy in learning, and integrating teaching and practice, obviously to enhance learning. They went on to explain that such an approach should include different teaching methods, activities, as well as a range of assessment procedures and continuous needs of analysis.

The necessity of tailoring teaching methods for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes is as real as it is for any other subject. Therefore, investigating various strategies to customize the content, process, product, and learning environment could enable EFL teachers to adapt their teaching methods to help their students achieve the communication skills and language proficiency required by foreign language learning. The exceptional teaching approach of differentiated instruction ensures no student is left behind by addressing their unique needs. However, the question remains: how can DI offer effective alternatives for EFL teachers to ensure their students attain a uniform level of English language proficiency by the end of a term, enabling them to excel in standardized tests [4]?

Methods of Differentiation. If our aim is improvement, we must adopt varied approaches tailored to each individual.

A classroom comprised of learners with diverse individual characteristics is termed as 'heterogeneous.' Such heterogeneity presents particular challenges for both learners and teachers. These challenges often manifest in maintaining discipline, sustaining learner engagement, selecting and utilizing appropriate teaching materials, and ensuring active participation of all learners in lesson activities.

There are several widespread and popular methods for teaching, training and developing English learners that guarantee successful results in the educational process. Differentiated instruction is the introduction of these activities, taking into account the learning characteristic of individuals in the educational process [5].

To differentiate instruction, a teacher needs the following important steps. They help ensure that each student is provided with appropriate instruction tailored to their individual learning needs and preferences [4]:

- Modify the elements of their lesson plans that respond to the content, process, and product.
- Consider the classroom environment as an element in differentiated instruction.
- Pre-assess their students to understand what they already know in relation to the content that will be taught.
- Group the students according to their knowledge level.
- Consider the students' interests and provide them with materials to work on according to those interests.
- Take into account the students' potential by having them work with materials that would reinforce their level of knowledge.

• Consider the ways students prefer to learn, referring to the types of intelligences students have: linguistic, logical/mathematical, visual/spatial, kinaesthetic, musical, naturalistic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal.

Tomlinson [14] lists three areas of curriculum that effective teachers link together: what learners will learn, i.e. the content; the activities through which they will learn, i.e. the process; and how they will present and extend what they have learned and understood, i.e. the product. Differentiated classroom strategies include:

1. Stations, which are different points in the classroom where students work on different tasks at the same time.
2. Complex Instruction, which creates equality of learning opportunities by using small instructional groups of students in intellectually challenging subjects.
3. Orbital Studies, which revolve around independent inquiry or discovery and some aspect of the curriculum.
4. Centres, most often centres of learning or interest, these, unlike stations, operate separately rather than in concert.
5. Tiered Activities, which maintain the focus of the activity but provide different access pathways at different levels of difficulty, so that learners with different learning needs work with the same basic ideas and use the same key skills [13].

Taking into account the cognitive abilities of the students, Tomlinson [25] also emphasized the significance of the learning environment in teaching instruction. This environment encompasses the classroom's routines, procedures, and physical layout, as well as the overall atmosphere or sentiment shared among the students and between the students and the teacher. These factors are crucial to consider when differentiating instruction [4].

Differentiated instruction can be visualized as a triangle of learning, with the teacher, content, and students forming the vertices. Each component is integral to the formation and sustenance of the entire teaching and learning process [5]. It is crucial to comprehend the dynamics among the students, teachers, and the content in a classroom to build a conducive learning environment that fortifies this learning triangle. Particularly in an EFL setting, it is vital to understand the students' motivations for learning English and how it can be advantageous for them. This understanding aids in tailoring the design of the English aspects they need to learn and the teaching methods to be employed [5].

To address the challenges of a heterogeneous classroom, various teaching solutions can be implemented. For instance:

1. Diversify topics, methods, and texts to cater to different learner interests and preferences.
2. Enhance activity engagement by incorporating visual aids. For example, students can create visual aids on various topics as part of their methodology classes, preparing for future teaching practice.
3. Employ a combination of compulsory and optional instructions, ensuring that every student completes a minimum portion of the task while allowing flexibility for those who wish to do more.
4. Utilize open-ended cues to prompt varied responses from students, fostering critical thinking and creativity.
5. Foster collaboration among students, encouraging cooperative work and peer teaching to maintain engagement with the language material, particularly when direct interaction with every student is not feasible.

Conclusion. This paper has underscored the importance of recognizing and responding to learner differences in age, gender, aptitude, motivation, learning styles, and personality. Differentiation, when carefully and thoughtfully implemented, allows for the accommodation of various learner needs, leading to more personalized and effective learning experiences. This approach not only improves motivation and critical thinking but also fosters a more inclusive and supportive classroom environment where all students have the opportunity to succeed.

In conclusion, this study advocates for a paradigm shift in language education, emphasizing the critical role of differentiation. It calls for a departure from rigid, standardized teaching methods towards more dynamic, student-centred approaches. Such a shift is essential not only for the effective teaching of English as a foreign language but also for fostering a learning environment where diversity is celebrated, and every learner's needs are addressed with precision and care.

Bibliography:

1. De Bruin K. Differentiation in the classroom: Engaging diverse learners through universal design for learning. Clayton Vic : Monash University, 2018. 50 c.
2. Eikeland I., Ohna S. E. Differentiation in education: a configurative review. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*. 2022. Vol. 8, № 3. C. 157–170. URL : <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2022.2039351>
3. Eisenmann M., Aicher-Jakob M., Seifert A. Teaching English: differentiation and individualisation. Leiden, 2019. 245 c.

4. Gaitas C. S., Carêto F. P., Castro Silva J. Differentiated instruction: 'to be, or not to be, that is the question'. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2022. С. 1–17. URL : <http://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2022.2119290>
5. Gregory G. H., Chapman C. Differentiated instructional strategies: One size doesn't fit all. Thousand Oaks, 2012. 232 с.
6. Heacox D. Differentiating instruction in the regular classroom. Minneapolis : Free Spirit Publishing Inc., 2012. 176 с.
7. McLelland N., Coffey S. Language teaching: learning from the past. Differentiation and diversity. Nottingham : University of Nottingham, 2021. URL : <https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/CLAS/Research/Modernlanguages-research-groups/Learning-from-the-past/Language-Teaching-Learning-fromthe-Past.aspx>.
8. Mills M., Monk S., Keddie A., Renshaw P., Christie P., Geelan D., Gowlett, C. Differentiated learning: From policy to classroom. *Oxford Review of Education*. 2014. Vol. 40, № 3. С. 331–348. URL : <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2014.911725>
9. Ortega D. P., Cabrera J. M., Benalcázar J. V. Differentiating instruction in the language learning classroom: Theoretical considerations and practical applications. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 2018. Vol. 9, № 6. С. 1220–1228.
10. Pham H. L. Differentiated instruction and the need to integrate teaching and practice. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*. 2012. Vol. 9, № 1. С. 13–20.
11. Pivkach I. O. Implementation of principles of individualization and differentiation in foreign language classes in high school. *Pedagogical Sciences: Theory and Practice*. 2024. № 1 (49). С. 122–127.
12. Raza K. Differentiated instruction in English language teaching: Insights into the implementation of Raza's teaching adaptation model in Canadian ESL. *TESL Ontario Contact*. 2020. Vol. 46, № 2. С. 41–50.
13. Reese S. Differentiation in the language classroom. *The Language Educator*. 2011. № 8. С. 40–46. URL : https://activecommunication.files.wordpress.com/2019/10/tle_aug11_article.pdf.
14. Tomlinson C. A. How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms (3-e vyd.). Alexandria, VA : ASCD, 2017. 186 с.
15. Williams M. J. Teacher perceptions of differentiated instruction in a standards-based grading middle school. *Educational Research: Theory and Practice*. 2023. Vol. 34, № 1. С. 129–150. URL : https://www.nrmera.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/V34-1_9-Williams-Teacher-Perceptions-of-Differentiated-Instruction.pdf.

References:

1. De Bruin, K. (2018). *Differentiation in the classroom: Engaging diverse learners through universal design for learning*. Clayton Vic : Monash University. 50 s.
2. Eikeland, I., & Ohna, S. E. (2022). Differentiation in education: A configurative review. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 8(3), 157–170. URL : <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2022.2039351>
3. Eisenmann, M., Aicher-Jakob, M., & Seifert, A. (2019). *Teaching English: Differentiation and individualisation*. Leiden : Brill Schöningh. 245 s.
4. Gaitas, C. S., Carêto, F. P., & Castro Silva, J. (2022). Differentiated instruction: 'To be, or not to be, that is the question'. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1–17. URL: <http://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2022.2119290>
5. Gregory, G. H., & Chapman, C. (2012). *Differentiated instructional strategies: One size doesn't fit all*. Thousand Oaks : Corwin Press. 232 s.
6. Heacox, D. (2012). *Differentiating instruction in the regular classroom*. Minneapolis : Free Spirit Publishing Inc. 176 s.
7. McLelland, N., & Coffey, S. (2021). *Language teaching: Learning from the past. Differentiation and diversity*. URL: <https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/CLAS/Research/Modernlanguages-research-groups/Learning-from-the-past/Language-Teaching-Learning-fromthe-Past.aspx>
8. Mills, M., Monk, S., Keddie, A., Renshaw, P., Christie, P., Geelan, D., & Gowlett, C. (2014). Differentiated learning: From policy to classroom. *Oxford Review of Education*, 40 (3), 331–348. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2014.911725>
9. Ortega, D. P., Cabrera, J. M., & Benalcázar, J. V. (2018). Differentiating instruction in the language learning classroom: Theoretical considerations and practical applications. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(6), 1220–1228.
10. Pham, H. L. (2012). Differentiated instruction and the need to integrate teaching and practice. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 9 (1), 13–20
11. Pivkach, I. O. (2024). Implementation of principles of individualization and differentiation in foreign language classes in high school. *Pedagogical Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 1 (49), 122–127.
12. Raza, K. (2020). Differentiated instruction in English language teaching: Insights into the implementation of Raza's teaching adaptation model in Canadian ESL. *TESL Ontario Contact*, 46 (2), 41–50.
13. Reese, S. (2011, August). Differentiation in the Language Classroom. *The Language Educator*, 40–46. URL : https://activecommunication.files.wordpress.com/2019/10/tle_aug11_article.pdf
14. Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA : ASCD. 186 s.
15. Williams, M. J. (2023). Teacher perceptions of differentiated instruction in a standards-based grading middle school. *Educational Research: Theory and Practice*, 34 (1), 129–150. URL : https://www.nrmera.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/V34-1_9-Williams-Teacher-Perceptions-of-Differentiated-Instruction.pdf (data zvernennia: 20.07.2024)

Бакиш Р. К., Густі І. І., Качур А. Диференціація в процесі навчання англійської мови

Стаття досліджує складні аспекти та фундаментальну необхідність диференціації в мовній освіті, зокрема в багатогранному контексті викладання англійської як іноземної мови (ІМ). Визнаючи, що учні далекі від однорідної групи, а навпаки, демонструють вражаючий спектр різноманітного досвіду, здібностей та мотивацій, дослідження критично аналізує традиційну освітню модель, яка нав'язує уніфікацію, нехтуючи індивідуальними відмінностями учнів. Концепція «загального учня» розглядається як оманлива ілюзія, яка недостатньо враховує унікальні та різноманітні потреби кожного студента. Стаття підкреслює важливість інноваційних, адаптованих викладацьких стратегій, що реагують на ці відмінності, дозволяючи учням просуватися у власному темпі та відповідно до їх стилів навчання.

Завдяки розширеному огляду наукової літератури, наше дослідження вивчає ключову роль диференціації як необхідного підходу в мовній освіті. Воно підкреслює, що диференціація може суттєво підвищити мотивацію, критичне мис-

лення та загальну мовну компетентність учнів. Стаття розглядає різні впливові фактори, такі як вік, стать, риси особистості та стилі навчання, які значно впливають на результати навчання ІМ. Автори закликають до зміни парадигми в навчанні ІМ, наголошуючи на критичній необхідності для викладачів приймати адаптивні методи навчання. Ця зміна вимагає продуманих модифікацій навчальних планів, креативного використання широкого спектру навчальних заходів і цілеспрямованого сприяння інклюзивному та підтримуючому навчальному середовищу. Зрештою, автори щиро закликають до постійного, рефлексивного діалогу серед викладачів для обміну цінним досвідом та поступового вдосконалення педагогічних практик, що, у свою чергу, забезпечує адекватне задоволення різноманітних та складних потреб усіх учнів у дедалі більш різноманітних та динамічних класах.

Ключові слова: відмінності серед учнів, диференціація, диференційоване навчання, індивідуальні відмінності учнів, методи диференціації, навчання англійської мови як іноземної, неоднорідний клас, стилі та стратегії навчання.

УДК 378.014.5:004.8]:005.336.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series5.2024.100.03>

Богомаз О. Ю.

ШТУЧНИЙ ІНТЕЛЕКТ ЯК ВИКЛИК СУЧАСНІЙ СИСТЕМІ ВИЩОЇ ОСВІТИ: МЕДІАКОМПЕТЕНТІСНИЙ ПІДХІД

У статті розглядається застосування штучного інтелекту у вищій освіті, а також вирішення завдань персоналізації навчання. Виявлено та проаналізовано необхідність впровадження штучного інтелекту в освітній процес закладів вищої освіти, а також технології, які вже використовуються. Розкрито сутність та уявлення про штучний інтелект, який постійно змінюється, трансформується, бачення шляхів його розвитку, підходи до вивчення та функціонування в цілому. У сучасному світі цифрових технологій і масової інформації медіакомпетентність стала ключовою навичкою, необхідною для ефективного функціонування в суспільстві. Штучний інтелект, інтегрований в освітній процес, відкриває нові можливості для розвитку цієї навички.

Особливу увагу приділено впливу штучного інтелекту на розвиток критичного мислення та аналізу інформації, що є невід'ємною частиною медіакомпетентності. Завдяки технологіям штучного інтелекту здобувачі освіти можуть навчитися розпізнавати фейки, аналізувати достовірність джерел і робити обґрунтовані висновки на основі наявних даних. Окрім позитивних аспектів, у статті також обговорюються можливі ризики та виклики, пов'язані з впровадженням штучного інтелекту в систему вищої освіти.

Стаття також акцентує увагу на необхідності підготовки викладачів до використання нових технологій і на розробці етичних норм для інтеграції штучного інтелекту в освітній процес. Важливим є питання збереження балансу між використанням технологій та традиційними методами навчання, що сприятиме формуванню гармонійної та медіакомпетентної особистості.

Проаналізувавши можливості застосування штучного інтелекту, дійшли висновку про можливості використання та вдосконалення технологій штучного інтелекту у закладах вищої освіти, підкреслюючи його значення у формуванні медіакомпетентності, а також визначили виклики, з якими стикаються освітяни в умовах швидкого розвитку цифрових технологій.

Ключові слова: штучний інтелект, вища освіта, професійна підготовка, медіакомпетентність.

Штучний інтелект швидкими темпами активно проникає у всі сфери людської життєдіяльності, особливо після того, коли наприкінці листопада 2022 року компанія OpenAI презентували світу низку цифрових сервісів, які називають штучним інтелектом. За даними The Guardian за два місяці після запуску кількість користувачів складала понад 100 млн, тобто у січні 2023 р. зафіксовано більше 590 млн відвідувань сайту від 100 млн унікальних користувачів [8]. Це спричинило справжній революційний прорив у розвитку штучного інтелекту.

У багатьох людей виникає уявлення, що штучний інтелект в освіті – це роботи замість вчителя або викладача. До початку 2030 року, за думкою авторів книги «Штучний інтелект в освіті. Перспективи та проблеми для викладання та навчання» [7] авторства Уейна Холмса, Майї Бяліка та Чарльза Фейдела, «штучний інтелект навчиться допомагати людині, співпрацювати з нею, навчати і виступати як посередник» [7]. Фактично штучний інтелект став невід'ємною частиною життя майже кожної людини, через що кардинально змінився побут, але окрім цього і відбуваються зміни в освітньому процесі закладів вищої освіти. Тому основним завданням вищої педагогічної освіти в сфері штучного інтелекту є кваліфікована підготовка майбутніх учителів.

Засновниками дослідження штучного інтелекту як науки й засобу трансформації життя, зокрема освіти, є: математик А. Тюрінг [9], який у 1950 році відзначив, що у машини відсутнє емоційне відчуття, провівши перший тест перевірки системи штучного інтелекту на інтелектуальність; А. Ньюелл, Г. Саймон та К. Шоу [6], котрі у 1955 році створили першу програму штучного інтелекту – «Логік-Теоретик»; професор