УДК 338.124.4

О.І. Герасимова,

к.пед.н., докторант відділу інновацій та стратегій розвитку освіти

Інституту педагогіки НАПН України

РЕТРОСПЕКТИВНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ПОНЯТТЯ «САМОРЕГУЛЬОВАНЕ НАВЧАННЯ» В ФІЛОСОФСЬКІЙ ТА ПСИХОЛОГО-ПЕДАГОГІЧНІЙ ЛІТЕРАТУРІ ЗАХІДНОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОГО ОСВІТНЬОГО ПРОСТОРУ

У статті аналізується підхід до поняття «саморегульоване навчання» західноєвропейський вчених, розглядається значення саморегульованого навчання в становленні освітніх і професійних компетенцій майбутніх фахівців, а також структура і етапи розвитку саморегульованого навчанняу студентів вищих навчальних закладів. Актуалізується проблема підготовки студентів, здатних до постійної саморегуляції. Уточнюється сутність понять «саморегулювання», «саморегульоване навчання» і звертається увага на специфіку його застосування в подальшому становленні й особистісному зростанні майбутніх фахівців.

Ключові слова: саморегулювання, саморегульоване навчання, самоосвіта, самостійна робота, самоосвітня діяльність.

В статье анализируется подход к понятию «саморегулируемое обучение» западноевропейский ученых, рассматривается значение саморегулируемого образования в становлении образовательных и профессиональных компетенций будущих специалистов, а также структура и этапы развития саморегулируемого образованияу студентов высших учебных заведений. Актуализируется проблема подготовки студентов, способных к постояннойсаморегулировке. Уточняется сущность понятий «саморегулировка», «саморегулируемое образование» и обращается внимание на специфику его применения в дальнейшем становлении и личностном росте будущих специалистов.

Ключевые слова: саморегулировка, саморегулируемое образование, самообразование, самостоятельная работа, самообразовательная деятельность.

The article deals with the approach to the concept of "self-regulated learning" of Western European scientists, the importance of self-regulated learning in the development of educational and professional competencies of future professionals, as well as the structure and stages of development of self-regulated learning in the course of students' training of higher educational institutions. The problem of students' training capable of continuous learning is actualized. The essence of the concepts "self-regulated", "self-regulated learning" is clarified and drawing attention to the specifics of their application in the future formation and personal growth of future specialists.

Keywords: self-regulated, self-regulated learning, self-education, independent work, self-educational activity.

Problem statement. SRL and critical pedagogy are associated with broad educational goals of empowerment, freedom, liberation, and democratic participation. Despite these commonalities, these vast literatures are seldom merged. In the effort to merge them, there are some guiding questions: 1) to what degree is SRL tied to the transformation of social reality for the purposes of mitigating inequality and discrimination; 2) what changes in social configurations are made possible through and from SRL, or in other words, does SRL align with the logic of adaptation or integration; and 3) does SRL support efficient and effective transmission of knowledge. While there is potential for variation in responses, there are compelling justifications for viewing SRL as competing and incompatible with Freire's educational philosophy. We suggest that teaching SRL encourages adaptation, prescription, and dependency. SRL pedagogy targets personal change that renders individuals amenable to existing social orders. Teaching SRL is prescriptive because there are homogenized and preformulated ways of being, knowing, and doing. Although suggesting incompatibility by

themselves, the first two charges are especially problematic given the alignment between neoliberalism and SRL. Teaching students to self-regulate their learning aligns with the neoliberal logic to produce adaptable, self-interested, responsibilized individuals so they can operate within environments that are characterized by choice, competition, and personalized learning. Inscribing this kind of subjectivity is connected to dependency in two ways. First, individuals are dependent on, what Rose refers to as, ''engineers of the soul'' to produce oneself as self-regulated [8, p. 6].

Second, producing self-regulated individuals creates a dependency on situational demands to institute personal changes.

The purpose of article. Briefly present the importance of self-regulated learning in the development of educational and professional competencies of future professionals, as well as the structure and stages of development of self-regulated learning in the course of students' training of higher educational institutions. The problem of students' training capable of continuous learning is actualized. The essence of the concepts "self-regulated", "self-regulated learning" is clarified and drawing attention to the specifics of their application in the future formation and personal growth of future specialists.

Results of theoretical research. Freire's concern that adaptation is a process that generates conformity and obedience to an existing social order has particular relevance for SRL. It is not uncommon for the notion of adaptation to be associated with SRL (e.g., Boekaerts and Corno; S. Vassallo Hadwin and Oshige; McCaslin and Burross; Post et al.; Schunk and Zimmerman). Boekaerts and Corno state, ''All theorists assume that students…adapt their thoughts, feelings, and actions as needed to affect their learning and motivation'' [5, p. 201]. As these authors state, educational psycyhologists associate SRL with the adaptation of personal variables. Describing their developmental model, Schunk and Zimmerman argue that individuals are not selfregulating unless they adaptively use previously learned strategies to meet new situational demands. Although the emphasis on adapting personal variables is central, researchers also suggest that

SRL involves environmental changes (Bandura; McCaslin and Burross; Schunk and Zimmerman).

In addition to planning, managing time, concentrating on instruction, organizing, rehearsing, and coding information strategically, Schunk and Zimmerman argue that successful adaptation includes establishing productive work environments and using social resources effectively. Other ways to influence the environment include, but are not limited to, asking teachers questions (e.g., Newman), selecting non-distracting peers with whom to collaborate (e.g., Zimmerman), choosing models to emulate (Martinez-Pons), and undertaking challenging activities (e.g., Bandura). It is important to note here that the environmental changes that educators discuss are those that support the achievement of personal learning goals.

Questions about what environments are and how they change is integral for considering critical pedagogical implications of teaching SRL. Not unlike in the SRL literature, the broad notion of adaptation in educators connotes both psychological and environmental changes (Piaget; Vidal). However, there is not always agreement about what environmental changes mean. Adaptation can involve a change in mental schemes or a change in external information to conform the world to schema (Piaget; Vidal; von Glasersfeld). From this view, as Jardine suggests, environments are not ''ready-made'' organizations that are imposed on a ''passive organism-subject'' [4, p. 133]. In other words, the environment is not a static preontological entity. Thus, adaptation involves modifying environments by using this schema to impose certain structures of its own. Viewing the environment as a perception and schematic production, which stems from a radical constructivist perspective (von Glasersfeld), endorses the assumption that individuals have the psychological means and mechanisms to transform their worlds.

Others within educators view environments and environmental formations differently. Sociocultural-oriented SRL researchers view environments as social, evolving, and co-constituted (Hadwin and Oshige; McCaslin and Burross).

McCaslin and Burross explain: cultural influences set norms and challenges that define what is probable for persons and social and cultural institutions. Probable is malleable nonetheless because personal and social influences can resist or work to change cultural norms and expectations [5, p. 327].

Base material. Although cultural and institutional forces shape environments, the logic underpinning this perspective is that individuals can participate with others to transform those contexts, which are viewed as emergent, dynamic, and malleable. From a sociocultural perspective, adaptation is not individuals changing themselves to ''fit'' an environment, but acting and interacting with others to give form to it. Hadwin and Oshige acknowledge this point and state that the ''notion of adaptive learning extends beyond individual selfregulation and instead to the community of practice – the way learning communities adapt and evolve as personal, social, and cultural influences come together'' [3, p. 249]. The emphasis on participation and malleability for environmental configurations brings SRL close to resembling integration.

However, although it makes sense to view environments as co-constituted and malleable, critical pedagogues are skeptical that all environments are infinitely malleable, constituted in a dialogic way, and independent of the workings of power. A key assumption of critical pedagogical philosophy is that there are structures independent of one's production and constitution of them, and that such structures operate to reproduce inequality by protecting dominant interests. There are existing orders that are protected by school administrators, teachers, curricula, policy (both local and national), and even some parents and students themselves, that shape possibilities and potentialities for environmental configurations. McCaslin and Burross acknowledge this point by stating, ''No source of influence – personal, social, and cultural – is equally distributed. One result, then, is differential opportunity for culturally valued, socially validated, personally desirable adaptive learning'' [5, p. 327]. Although some sociocultural researchers emphasize the malleability and co-constitution of environments, aligning in part with the logic of integration, they ignore the power dynamic in that constitution.

Schooling environments are political and ideological places that protect certain structures, ones that are not easy to change. For example, neoliberal logic continues to transform schooling in particular ways that are protected by policies, values, and culture. Neoliberalism is an economic logic that is underpinned by the idea that the best way to ensure prosperity and equal opportunity is to transform all economic and social arrangements to operate as if there were a free market.

In thinking about adaptation and SRL, it is important to consider what is supposed to change, what can change, what kind of change is possible, and whose voices inform those changes. The adaptable self-regulated learner is one who can monitor, evaluate, and change, if necessary, personal variables to meet situational demands. Environmental changes are included in SRL, but reflect modest and self-interested ones. The changes that SRL researchers discuss may support adaptation to neoliberal educational structures, rendering individuals better test-takers and efficient workers. Self-regulated environmental modifications are not explicitly directed at mitigating inequalities.

Researchers suggest that different cultural groups inscribe selves that are fundamentally at odds with the self of SRL and neoliberalism. Working class selfhood comes close to resembling the communal self. Martin characterizes the communal self as embedded within a time and place. It is a relational self. Unlike the scientific and expressive selves, the communal self is not committed to an ethic of self-study and selfimprovement. Psychological states are not featured as the source and cause of activity and outcomes. Working-class selfhood does not arguably resemble the ideal communal self. However, there are features of this brand of selfhood that come closer to the communal self than to the other two selves. Researchers argue that in working-class environments the self is socially mediated and part of a collective identity. As Schutz contends, individuals from working-class backgrounds are likely to express selfhood in terms of collective struggle. Kusserow adds that working-class selfhood is not organized around a commitment to understand, study, and identify psychological states as sources of action.

On the other hand, Schutz argues that middle-class families celebrate children's unique characteristics and capabilities, helping them develop a sense of themselves as discrete individuals. In addition, he contends that middle-class children learn at an early age to monitor themselves and use techniques of surveillance to achieve personal learning goals. This self is constructed in relation to a number of psychological features, such as intentions, attitudes, strengths, weaknesses, and beliefs. Middle-class selfhood is characterized by a composite of psychological features that must be monitored and controlled. Weininger and Lareau argue that middle-class guardians work closely with children to develop their dispositions and skills for this type of self-management. Middle-class selfhood is individualistic, and entitled.

The working-class self stands in contrast to the kind of self that underpins SRL. However, there is overlap between middle-class selfhood, SRL, and neoliberalism. This brief overview points to the possibilities that teaching SRL involves prescribing a particular kind of self that endorses neoliberalism and validates middle-class conventions. Additional support for this point is detected in the discourse related to those behaviors and thought processes that are considered adaptive self-regulation. For example, help-seeking is identified as an important strategy for SRL. Bandura argues that individuals cannot control every part of a social context, and therefore, must use others for the purpose of achieving personal goals. Bandura uses the notion of proxy agency to describe this process, whereas many SRL researchers use help-seeking.

Help-seeking involves particular ways of thinking, dispositions for negotiation, rational deliberations, and perceptions. Newman explains: When students monitor their academic performance, show awareness of difficulty they cannot overcome on their own, and exhibit the wherewithal and self-determination to remedy that difficulty by requesting assistance from a more knowledgeable individual, they are exhibiting mature, strategic behavior [6, p. 132].

Puustinen add: Self-regulated learners – and help-seekers – do not ask for help needlessly when they are capable of solving the problem by

themselves….they confine their questions to just those hints and explanations needed to allow them to finish performing the task on their own [7, pp. 161–162].

From these descriptions, to effectively help-seek, individuals must: 1) work independently by exhausting all their resources to complete a task; 2) recognize the limitations in personal knowledge, skill, and efficacy to complete the task; 3) ask certain questions that serve only to facilitate progress towards task completion; and 4) interact and negotiate with individuals who are seen as having the resources to complete the task. Students must seek help only after extensive thought and reflection (requiring self-knowledge and commitments to reflection and evaluation) and for the purpose of independently completing tasks.

This portrait of the self-regulated learner strongly reflects the neoliberal mandate to make individuals responsible for their own life projects by not only relying on independent personal changes, but also by using others as instruments to attain a personal goal. Help-seeking is also tied to the mandate to be productive and execute a plan of action. Furthermore, the representation of help-seeking in the SRL literature is entangled in class-based norms. Researchers observe differences in help-seeking behaviors and dispositions across children from middle- and working-class backgrounds. Middle-class children are described as comfortable interacting with adults as equals, operating with a sense of entitlement, possessing verbal agility, and having a psychologically informed personal learning profile.

Like the requirements for selfhood, there are specific kinds of behaviors, ones that map onto middle-class conventions and align with the logic of neoliberalism, that count as adaptive SRL. Therefore, teaching SRL can normalize, homogenize, and naturalize the features of personhood that are culturally and ideologically narrow. Apple argues that, ''…the educational task…is to change people's understanding of themselves as members of collective groups. Instead, to support a market economy we need to encourage everyone to think of themselves as individuals who always act in ways that maximize their own interests'' [1, p. 23]. That is, teaching SRL encourages individuals to think of themselves as: 1) radically internalized, self-interested, and individualistic; 2) tied instrumentality to

oneself and others; 3) committed to self-enhancement; and 4) disconnected from the kinds of communal involvements that engender strong moral and social ties. In this regard, teaching SRL can be restrictive of ontological possibilities, and can be implicated in invalidating, marginalizing, and pathologizing communal identities.

Conclusion. The emancipatory impetus is particularly prominent in critical traditions and approaches where the aim of education is conceived as emancipating students from oppressive practices and structures in the name of social justice and human freedom. The discourse of SRL is also tied to this educational agenda, as it has been tied to economic emancipation, democratic participation, and empowerment. From a Freirian perspective, therefore, SRL can be construed as complicance and obedience to neoliberal governance in Western societies. This consideration of SRL pedagogy has important implications, as researchers and teachers treat SRL as a neutral, value-free form of engagement that supports student success and emancipation. From this reading of SRL, efforts to teach SRL can be seen as a way to produce narrow and normative ways of engagement that affirm problematic pedagogical arrangements.

References :

1. Apple M. W. Understanding and interrupting neoliberalism and neoconservatism in education: / M. W. Apple. – Pedagogies: An International Journal, 1. 2006. – Pp. 21 – 26.

2. Boekaerts M., & Corno L. Self-regulation in the classroom: A perspective on assessment and intervention: / M. Boekaerts, L. Corno. – Applied Psychology: An International Review, 54. 2005. – Pp. 199 – 231.

3. Hadwin A., & Oshige M. Self-regulation, coregulation, and socially shared regulation: Exploring perspectives of social in self-regulated learning theory: / A. Hadwin, M. Oshige. – Teachers College Record, 113. 2011. – Pp. 240 – 264.

4. Jardine D. Jean Piaget and the origins of intelligence: A return to ''life itself.'' In G: / D. Jardine. – Goodman (Ed.), Educational psychology

reader: The art and science of how people learn. New York, NY: Peter Lang. 2010. – Pp. 130 – 148.

5. McCaslin M., & Burross H. L. Research on individual differences within a sociocultural perspective: Co-regulation and adaptive learning: / M. McCaslin, H. L. Burross. – Teachers College Record, 113. 2011. – Pp. 325 – 349.

6. Newman R. S. How self-regulated learners cope with academic difficulty: The role of adaptive help seeking: / R. S. Newman. – Theory into Practice, 41. 2002. – Pp. 132–138.

7. Puustinen M., Lyyra A. L., Metsa¨pelto R. L., & Pulkkinen L. Children's help seeking: The role of parenting: / M. Puustinen, A. L. Lyyra, R. L. Metsa¨pelto, L. Pulkkinen. – Learning and Instruction, 18. 2008. – Pp. 160 – 171.

8. Rose N. Governing the soul: The shaping of the private self: / N. Rose. – London: Free Associations Books. 1999. – Pp. 6 – 10.