

Yaroslava Artemenko,

PhD in Philosophy, associate professor of Philosophy and Sociology Department,
National University of Pharmacy, Kharkiv, Ukraine

UNIVERSITY NOWADAYS: THE “END” OR THE “TURN” OF THE HISTORY?

The events of the last two years have actualized a serious problem that goes beyond particular education issues. This is the problem of the university prospects in the conditions of crisis which embraces not only the education but also the entire socio-cultural paradigm of our time. Last spring, this problem was formulated by the Italian philosopher G. Agamben in a quite a radical form, as “the end of the 10-century university history”, which was summed up by the situation of a forced switch to the online form of study. “The loss of the face forever enclosed in the spectrum of the screen”, the destruction of student associations, the collapse of the infrastructure of university campuses, the onset of the “telematic dictatorship and technical barbarism era” calls into question the very existence of a university as a specific cultural *topos*, social institution, educational platform, system of interpersonal relations, as well as studentshood as a like-minded people community, united ideologically, co-existentially and territorially.

The crisis of the university education fell on the cultural and historical constellation (perhaps it is too early to call it an *era*), which is characterized by such features as:

- digitalization and technologization of all social life aspects;
- destruction of traditional social ties and emergence the situational systems of interaction instead;
- radical individualization;
- crisis of the multicultural social communication model and, as a result,
- the formation of a special "sensitivity" to the problems of history, ecology, the rights of an individual, the limits of the human in general.

The new cultural constellation, which took shape by the second decade of the 21st century, was called *metamodernism (or post-postmodernism)* and declared itself as a new turn in history, its continuation after the previously announced “end” (F. Fukuyama). Researchers and ideologists of the new cultural paradigm (F. Jameson, E. Gibbons, R. van den Akker, T. Vermeulen, L. Constantinou, J. McDowell) insist that metamodernity is a state of culture that re-constructs such lost value dominants as sincerity, responsibility, involvement and solidarity. From

the point of view of its researchers, metamodernity presupposes an attitude towards cultural or historical poles in which the conflict of differences is removed not by leveling the diversity of experiences, but by establishing a dynamic balance between them. Metamodernism does not deny possible hierarchies, "orders of discourse" or taxonomies. It inscribes them into the system of relations identified by van den Akker and Vermeulen in terms of "as if" modality: *as if* history could have some meaning, *as if* humanity would be moving towards the realization of its rationality, *as if* progress could make society more harmonious.

The technical base of the metamodern culture is digital technologies, which, on the one hand, simplify the processing of information, on the other hand, make an individual vulnerable, since these technologies work in areas traditionally considered as the anthropological prerogatives: cognition, creativity and communication.

Within the framework of the digital revolution, a new language of culture is also being formed: uniform, technical, historically flexible, ironic in relation to stable discursive constructs, trans-referential, and, as a result, more universal than, for instance, the Latin of classical science or more transparent than any natural language that tries to describe the individual experience.

The transformations occurring in culture correlate with changes in the objectives of modern education. The university educational strategy was traditionally focused on three aspects:

- creation of a fundamental, universal and systemic base for the training of a future professional,
- conduction of special preparation itself,
- formation of personal skills that contribute to the social implementation of learning outcomes (soft skills).

Contemporary education is focused mainly on the implementation of utilitarian and professional tasks. This is explained, on the one hand, by the economization of previously non-market areas and, on the other, by the technologization of intellectual activity. These factors contributed to the formation of a stable mental stereotype that *knowledge is a resource*, i.e., a capacious and the most effective way to solve problems. Knowledge as a reflexive activity, creativity, work of self-awareness, search or dialogical interaction is discredited by the pragmatics of everyday life. The soft skills within the framework of educational strategies, are often understood as mastering basically the *technologies* of representation and communication, or competencies, rather than their *content*. While the classical university education is not an information resource but rather

humanitarian, that is, human, acquisition. It lays the foundations for the intellectual culture of society, forms its elite, promotes the building up of integrative ties within professional communities, diversifies the forms of knowledge and, in the end, creates value references in which the competence of specialists is not reduced to their “speed” or loyalty to a given standard. Simply put, “shortening the path” is not always the best way to achieve a good goal.

Today, it is obvious that the end of the 10-century classical university history is a quite natural. The crisis that manifested itself during a pandemic is a symptom of deeper processes taking place in society and human consciousness. The key terms expressing their entity could be "resource capacity", "economy" and "individualism". Neural networks technologies (improving as faster as everyday life grows deeper into virtual reality) successfully compete with the mechanisms of human thinking, surpassing it in speed and efficiency. The volume of remote classes audience is many times bigger than the size of traditional classrooms. The time and place of the educational process becomes an optional convention. The format of online conferences turns out to be much safer than traditional university disputes, with their tense, conversational dramaticism, intensity and face-to-face meetings of opponents.

What are the prospects for the university history? Can we hope for the new turn, not the end of it? And what particular tendencies could be outlined as possible ways out of the crisis? To my mind, a university as a special community should use the potential of a new, metamodern era, namely, flexibility and the will to take into account cultural and ideological differences. Another step could be the democratization of relations within the education institution itself, where not only a student, but also a teacher has inalienable rights. It is important also, in my opinion, to keep the *chronotopos* of the university academic activity intact. A live classroom atmosphere can't be substituted by the individually neutral online presence. Plus, the 24/7 teacher's accessibility mode destroys not only the personal space of all the participants of the academic process, but also devalues the meaning of study as a personal conscious, strong-willed, independent and creative effort. Continuous training interaction does not include the well-articulated dialogue automatically, it reduces study to the process of getting information.

Technologization is a logical consequence of progress. But, in my opinion, it is necessary to technologize, first of all, the non-creative spheres of university life (technical checks, access to materials or conduction of events with a large number of participants). Study as an essential element of university education, where live contact, concentration, and direct interaction are important, nowadays risks losing

its originality and effectiveness if directed along the path of simplification, economization, standardization and “resourcefulness”.

A special problem is the preservation of the students communities and the teachers collegial corporation from their dissolution. The return to the values of solidarity, responsibility and sincerity, proclaimed by the ideologists of the metamodernism, is possible within the framework of a university as an institution. Intensification of academic exchange, de-ideologization of university life, stimulation of university research activities, giving teachers the right to choose methods and forms of work with the audience, maintaining the separation of the functions of a teacher and a student, increasing requirements for the quality of pre-university training as well, could serve as an increase in the status of university education and preserve it as a flexible and structurally stable institution with a rich 10-century history.

Maksym Doichyk,

PhD in Philosophy, associate professor, Head of Philosophy, Sociology and Religious Studies Department, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University;
Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine

Oksana Doichyk,

PhD in Philology, associate professor of the Department of English Philology,
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University;
Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine

Alla Sinitsyna,

PhD in Philosophy, associate professor of the Department of Philosophy and Ukrainian Studies, Ivano-Frankivsk National Medical University,
Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN LIGHT OF THE PRESENT SITUATION IN UKRAINIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

The present-day concept of “academic integrity” is used by everyone except the lazy: in their powerful inspirational speeches, reports on the improvement of education quality, etc. It has become fashionable to talk about academic integrity; it is mentioned in all the laws on every educational level, it is welcomed in grants and by donors, it is actively “liked” in various social networks, it is considered to be a great benefit in the critical reviews from controlling institutions. The concept is most frequently mentioned in the context of its violations, namely, academic