

БАЛКАНСКО НАУЧНО ОБОЗРЕНИЕ

Основано през 2017 г.

16+

№ 1
2018

Излизащо на всеки 3
месеца научно списание
(4 пъти в годината)

Основател - «Научен хронограф» ЕООД

Главен редактор

Линков Александър Йорданов, PhD, доцент

Заместник главен редактор:

Абасова Къзългюл Ясин къзъ, доктор на философските науки, професор
Берберян Ася Суреновна, доктор на психологическите науки, професор
Исламгулова Светлана Костадиновна, доктор на педагогическите науки, доцент
Клишков Георги Тодоров, PhD, главен асистент
Курилова Анастасия Александрова, доктор на икономическите науки, професор
Мамичев Александър Юриевич, доктор на политическите науки, кандидат на юридическите науки, доцент
Майхджик-Микула Джоана, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
Осадченко Ина Ивановна, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
Тарантей Виктор Петрович, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
Шарипов Фаридун Файзулаевич, доктор на педагогическите науки

Редакционна колегия:

Борисов Галин Цоков, доктор, професор
Бурдева Таня Викторовна, доктор, доцент
Бурмикина Ирина Викторовна, доктор на социологическите науки, професор
Василев Веселин Костов, доктор на психологическите науки, професор
Васковска Галина Алексеевна, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
Дамянов Бисер Илиев, доктор на изкуствознание, професор
Демченко Ирина Иванова, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
Джабарова Юлия Владимировна, доктор, доцент
Димитрова Теофана Валентинова, доктор, доцент
Зибарев Александър Григориевич, член-кореспондент на Руската академия на науките, доктор на икономическите науки, професор, главен научен сътрудник
Коберник Александър Николаевич, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
Комар Таисия Василевна, доктор на психологическите науки, професор
Коновалчук Валентина Ивановна, доктор на философските науки, доцент
Коростелев Александър Алексеевич, доктор на педагогическите науки, доцент
Костова Иванка Милкова, доктор, професор
Масюк Наталия Николаевна, доктор на икономическите науки, професор
Мордовцев Андрей Юриевич, доктор на юридическите науки, професор
Мотов Ирена, доктор на науките в отрасъл социална педагогика, професор
Нестеряк Юрий Василевич, доктор на науките за държавното управление, доцент
Розенберг Геннадий Самуилович, член-кореспондент на Руската академия на науките, доктор на биологическите науки, професор
Севастианов Сергей Виталиевич, доктор на политическите науки, доцент
Станев Велин Стефанов, доктор, професор
Тсириготис Константинос, доктор на науките в отрасъл психология, професор
Фелхнер Анджей, доктор на науките в отрасъл по история на образованието, професор
Фиделюс Анна, доктор на науките в отрасъл специална педагогика, професор
Чепил Мария Мироновна, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
Швитава Ирениуш, доктор на науките в отрасъл философия, професор
Юнусов Ахат Ахнафович, доктор на юридическите науки, професор
Якунин Вадим Николаевич, доктор на историческите науки, професор
Янев Борян Георгиев, доктор, доцент

Отговорен секретар

Клишкова Ина Атанасова

Зарегистрирано от Министерството на културата (с декларация 7а, ал.3 от Закона за задължително депозиране на печатни и други произведения) № 26-00-693 от 29.10.2018 г.

Компютърен набор:
Никола Николов

Технически редактор:
Йорданка Петкова

Адрес на редколегия, учредител,
редакция и издател -
«Научен хронограф» ЕООД:
България, гр. Перушица 4225,
Област Пловдив, Община
Перушица, ул. "Д. Малинчев", №33
Тел.: +359895612046
E-mail: balka@abv.bg;
balkansciereview@gmail.com
Сайт: balkan-sci-review.com

Подписано за печат 23.10.2018.
Излиза на 26.11.2018.
Формат 60x84 1/8.
Оперативен печат.
Условно отпеч. листове 10,63.
Тираж 50 екз. Поръчка 2-17-12.

Печатница "Fast Print Books"
Ул. "Густав Вайганд" 1, 4000
Център, Пловдив, България
Свободна цена

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ЗА ЧЛЕНОВЕТЕ НА РЕДАКЦИОННАТА КОЛЕГИЯ

Главен редактор

Линков Александър Йорданов, PhD, доцент
(Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“, Пловдив, България)

Заместник главен редактор:

Абасова Къзългюл Ясин къзъ, доктор на философските науки, професор, заместник декан на факултета по социални науки и психология
(Бакински държавен университет, Баку, Азербайджан)
Берберян Ася Суреновна, доктор на психологическите науки, професор, завеждащ катедра „Психология“
(Руско-Арменски Славянски университет, Ереван, Армения)
Исламгулова Светлана Костадиновна, доктор на педагогическите науки, доцент, проректор по наука и акредитация
(Университет “Туран”, Алма-ата, Казахстан)
Клинков Георги Тодоров, PhD, главен асистент
(Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“, Пловдив, България)
Курилова Анастасия Александрова, доктор на икономическите науки, професор
(Толятински държавен университет, Толяяти, Русия)
Майхджик-Микула Джоана, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
(Университет Ян Кохановски, Келце, Полша)
Мамичев Александър Юриевич, доктор на политическите науки, кандидат на юридическите науки, доцент, завеждащ катедра
„Теория и история на Руското и международно право“
(Владивостокски държавен университет по икономика и обслужване, Владивосток, Русия)
Осадченко Ина Ивановна, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
(Умански педагогически университет, Уман, Украйна)
Тарантей Виктор Петрович, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
(Гродненски държавен университет, Гродно, Беларусия)
Шарипов Фаридун Файзулаевич, доктор на педагогическите науки, завеждащ общо университетската катедра по педагогика
(Таджикски национален университет, Душанбе, Таджикистан)

Редакционна колегия:

Борисов Галин Цоков, доктор, професор, заместник декан на педагогическия факултет, директор на департамента за квалификация и професионално развитие на педагогическите специалисти, катедра „Педагогика и управлението на образованието“
(Пловдивски университет Паисий Хилендарски, Пловдив, България)
Бурдева Тая Суринова, доктор, доцент, ръководител на катедра „Музика“
(Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“, Пловдив, България)
Бурмикина Ирина Викторовна, доктор на социологическите науки, професор, проректор по научната работа
(Липецки държавен педагогически университет, Липецк, Русия)
Василев Веселин Костов, доктор на психологическите науки, професор
(Пловдивски университет “Паисий Хилендарски”, Пловдив, България)
Васковска Галина Алексеевна, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор, старши научен сътрудник, завеждаща отдел «Дидактика»
(Институт по педагогика към Националната Академия за педагогически науки на Украйна, Киев, Украйна)
Дамянов Бисер Илиев, доктор на изкуствознание, професор, ръководител на катедра „Естетическо възпитание“
(Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“, Пловдив, България)
Демченко Ирина Иванова, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
(Умански държавен педагогически университет, Уман, Украйна)
Джабарова Юлия Владимировна, доктор, доцент, заместник декан на факултета по икономически и социални науки
(Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“, Пловдив, България)
Димитрова Теофана Валентинова, доктор, доцент, ръководител на катедра „Маркетинг и международни икономически отношения“
(Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“, Пловдив, България)
Зибарев Александър Григориевич, член-кореспондент на Руската академия на науките, доктор на икономическите науки, професор,
главен научен сътрудник
(Институт по екология на Волжкия басейн Р.А.Н., Толяяти, Русия)
Коберник Александър Миколайович, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
(Умански държавен педагогически университет, Уман, Украйна)
Комар Таисия Василевна, доктор на психологическите науки, професор
(Хмелницки национален университет, Хмелницки, Украйна)
Коновалчук Валентина Ивановна, доктор на философските науки, доцент
(Черкаски областен институт за след дипломно образование на педагогическите работници, Черкаси, Украйна)
Коростелев Александър Алексеевич, доктор на педагогическите науки, доцент, професор към катедра „Педагогика и методика на преподаването“
(Толятински държавен университет, Толяяти, Русия)
Костова Иванка Милкова, доктор, професор, катедра „Маркетинг и международни икономически отношения“
(Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“, Пловдив, България)
Масюк Наталия Николаевна, доктор на икономическите науки, професор от катедра „Управление“
(Владивостокски държавен университет по икономика и обслужване, Владивосток, Русия)
Мордовцев Андрей Юриевич, доктор на юридическите науки, професор от катедра „Теория и история на Руското и международно право“
(Владивостокски държавен университет по икономика и обслужване, Владивосток, Русия)
Мотов Ирена, доктор на науките в отрасъл социална педагогика, професор
(Хуманитарно-икономическа Академия, Лодз, Полша)
Нестеряк Юрий Василевич, доктор на науките за държавното управление, доцент
(Национален авиационен университет, Киев, Украйна)
Розенберг Геннадий Самуилович, член-кореспондент на Руската академия на науките, доктор на биологическите науки, професор,
(Институт по екология на Волжкия басейн Р.А.Н., Толяяти, Русия)
Севастианов Сергей Виталиевич, доктор на политическите науки, доцент, професор от катедрата по „Международни отношения“
(Далеко-източен федерален университет, Владивосток, Русия)
Станев Велин Стефанов, доктор, професор, катедра „Маркетинг и международни икономически отношения“
(Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“, Пловдив, България)
Тсириготис Константинос, доктор на науките в отрасъл психология, професор
(Университет Ян Кохановски, Келце, Полша)
Фелхнер Анджей, доктор на науките в отрасъл по история на образованието, професор
(Университет Ян Кохановски, Келце, Полша)
Фиделюс Анна, доктор на науките в отрасъл специална педагогика, професор
(Университет Кардинал Стефан Вишински, Варшава, Полша)
Чепил Мария Мионовна, доктор на педагогическите науки, професор
(Драгобич държавен педагогически университет, Драгобич, Украйна)
Шьвитава Ирениуш, доктор на науките в отрасъл философия, професор
(Педагогически университет на името на КЕН, Краков, Полша)
Юнусов Ахат Ахнафович, доктор на юридическите науки, професор от катедра „Криминално право и процес“
(Казански иновационен университет, Казан, Русия)
Якунин Вадим Николаевич, доктор на историческите науки, професор, проректор по научната и иновационна дейност
(Поволжски държавен университет за обслужване, Толяяти, Русия)
Янев Борян Георгиев, доктор, доцент
(Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“, Пловдив, България)

SCIENTIFIC AND METHODOLOGICAL INSTRUMENT FOR INORGAN EDUCATION IN PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF FUTURE SOCIAL PEDAGOGES Pavlyk Nadiia Pavlivna.....	64
STUDENTS' INDEPENDENT STUDY AS A FACTOR FOR IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION Pliushch Valentyna Mykolaivna.....	69
CREATING A NEW PARADIGM OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION AS A COMPONENT PART OF REFORMING GERMAN UNIVERSITIES Tcherkashyn Sergiy Volodymyrovych.....	72
FEATURES OF REALIZATION OF PEDAGOGICAL TECHNOLOGIES OF PROFILE EDUCATION Vaskivska Halyna Oleksiivna.....	76
FEATURES OF PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE OF PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE GREAT BRITAIN Zorochkina Tetiana Sergiivna.....	80
Conditions of accommodation of scientific materials.....	85

UDC 378

CREATING A NEW PARADIGM OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION AS A COMPONENT PART OF REFORMING GERMAN UNIVERSITIES

© 2018

Tcherkashyn Sergiy Volodymyrovych, candidate of philological sciences,
assistant professor of the department of German philology
Kharkiv National Pedagogical University named Grigori Skovoroda
(60000, Ukraine, Kharkiv, Valentynivska Street, 2, e-mail: tscherkaschin@ukr.net)

Abstract. The given article informs on a course of realization of program positions of the Bologna declaration in the German higher education system. The author specifies the most important preliminary result of reforming: absence of appreciable quality improvement of German higher education and decrease of professional training standards. The author lists several problems with which the given reform collides, and allocates the most important of them – chronic under financing of educational branch by the state. Suspense of this problem breaks the promotion of reforms, including because of the position of direct participants of Bologna process: teachers, scientists and managers of higher schools. It is connected, as the author of the given article specifies, with inconsistency, ambiguity and crudity of measures authorized by the competent ministries and departments. The problems of reforming the sphere of German university education arise not so much because of insufficient funding of this sphere by the German state or due to the lack of political will in the implementing reforms. The need for their implementation does not cause doubts in the German academic environment and German society. The German academic community is also aware of the need to develop and introduce a new paradigm of university education, which also does not exclude the emergence of new problems, primarily because of the complexity of the modern stage of civilization development, which very quickly changes the nature of university education and presents to it more and more new and high requirements. To prevent possible threats of destruction of European and German universities or their transformation into fabrics producing good qualified executors of international corporations' will, universities and the whole society should take into account the fact that the complication of the modern world leads to the complication of the cognitive process, requires the application of new approaches to the organization of university education based on anthropologization and discursive knowledge, the main characteristics of which are its variability, fluidity, inconsistency and heterogeneity. The rejection of linearity, reproduction in education also implies the rejection of «ready-made» knowledge. On the contrary, the task of the participants in the educational process (of students and teachers as its subjects) is their joint search and joint creation of knowledge, which does not contradict the neo-humanistic concept of German university education, authored by V. von Humboldt. It means acquiring knowledge, which becomes what it is, in the process of searching for truth.

Keywords: modularization, accreditation, curricula, professional suitability, professional aptitude; professionalism; forming competences

УТВОРЕННЯ НОВОЇ ПАРАДИГМИ УНІВЕРСИТЕТСЬКОЇ ОСВІТИ ЯК СКЛАДОВА ЧАСТИНА ПРОЦЕСУ РЕФОРМУВАННЯ НІМЕЦЬКИХ УНІВЕРСИТЕТІВ

© 2018

Черкашин Сергій Володимирович, кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри німецької філології
Харківський національний педагогічний університет ім. Г. С. Сковороди
(60000, Україна, Харків, вул. Валентинівська, 2, e-mail: tscherkaschin@ukr.net)

Анотація. Дана стаття повідомляє про хід реалізації програмних положень Болонської декларації в системі вищої освіти Німеччини. Автор привертає увагу до найважливіших попередніх результатів реформування, а саме: відсутності відчутного зростання якості університетської освіти в Німеччині та зниженні рівня професійної підготовки фахівців. Автор перераховує проблеми, з якими стикається дана реформа, і виділяє найважливішу з них – хронічне недофінансування освітньої галузі державою. Невирішеність цієї проблеми гальмує просування реформ, в тому числі через позицію безпосередніх учасників Болонського процесу: викладачів, учених і керівників університетів. Це пов'язано, як вказує автор статті, з непослідовністю, двозначністю і непродуманістю санкціонованих міністерствами і відомствами заходів. Одна з основних причин такої однобічності в реалізації реформ полягає у відсутності достатнього обсягу фінансових коштів. Збільшення цього обсягу може дозволити університетам здійснити великомасштабні і дорогі проекти, які дійсно здатні наповнити реформовані структури університетської освіти ФРН новим змістом. Це призведе до зміни традиційної парадигми університетської освіти відповідно до вимог, що бурхливо розвивається суспільства знання і забезпечить повною мірою конкурентоспроможність німецьких університетів і німецької університетської науки на глобальному ринку освітніх послуг. В умовах здійснення технократичної за своїм характером Болонської реформи перед німецьким, втім, як і перед будь-яким європейським університетом виникає, з одного боку, загроза його загибелі як інституту або, принаймні, його перетворення в транслятора вже не актуальних і фрагментованих знань. З іншого боку, існує також небезпека перетворення університету в фабрику з виробництва освітнього продукту із задалегідь визначеними властивостями, в наявності яких зацікавлені міжнародні корпорації. Для запобігання всіх цих загроз університети і все суспільство повинні враховувати той факт, що ускладнення сучасного світу призводить до ускладнення процесу його пізнання, вимагає застосування нових підходів до організації університетської освіти на основі антропологізації і дискурсивної знання, головними характеристиками якого стає його мінливість, плінність, суперечливість і різноманітність. Відмова від лінійності, репродуктивності в освіті також передбачає відмову від «готового» знання. Навпаки, завданням учасників освітнього процесу, студента і викладача як його суб'єктів, стає його спільний пошук і спільне створення, що аж ніяк не суперечить неогуманістичній концепції німецької університетської освіти, автором якої є В. фон Гумбольдт. У цій концепції, яка наразі не втратила своєї значущості для німецької університетської освіти, ідеться саме про сприйняття всіх учасників освітнього процесу в якості суб'єктів набуття знання, яке стає тим, чим воно є, в процесі пошуку істини.

Ключові слова: модуляризація, акредитація, навчальні програми, професійна придатність, професіоналізм, формування компетенцій

Statement of the problem. Currently, quite detailed studies of the implementation of the program provisions of the Bologna Declaration and other international agreements, which have been adopted in the framework of this process, allow us to conclude about the success achieved in the field

of German university education. However, it should be noted that this success has affected, above all, the formal side of the reforms. That is, German politicians and officials working in the field of higher education ensured the reform of outdated university structures and contributed to the creation of

new ones. However, the filling of these structures with new content, expected by reform participants, did not happen.

One of the main reasons for such one-sidedness in the implementation of reforms is the lack of sufficient financial resources. The increase in this volume may allow universities to carry out large-scale and expensive projects that are truly capable of filling the reformed structures of German university education with new content. This will lead to changes in the traditional university education paradigm in accordance with the requirements of a booming knowledge society and ensure the full competitiveness of German university education and German university science in the global market of educational services.

The chronic underfunding of German universities, observed over many decades, is accompanied by universal cost savings and does not allow German universities to fully develop and attract the best specialists to carry out their daily functions and carry out successful and effective reforms. In addition, the training and research quality requirements become increasingly high, the list of functions performed by university scientists expands, and their workload increases. All this makes them blindly perform tasks imposed from the outside, does not allow them to participate actively in the process of reforming higher education, show their own initiative, defend their professional position and suggest the best solutions of actual problems.

All these consequences of ill-considered and in some cases incompetent reform leads to the outflow of university scholars to other activity spheres, what causes a general decline of the level of research and teaching activities at German universities. These problems are aggravated by the outwardly successful introduction of new, shortened and accelerated forms of professional training of young specialists, what does not always lead to a significant increase of its quality, in particular, in undergraduate studies. There is a feeling that the Bologna reform, the basic component of which is the introduction of market mechanisms in all areas of university activity, is perceived by the German educational establishment as a measure aimed solely at solving university financing problems, and not at improving the teaching and research quality.

Analysis of recent research and publications. It is obvious that the need to reform the German higher education system and the urgency of improving strategies and tactics of its implementation, suggesting a constant diagnosis of the current state of affairs and forecasting possible errors and failures in the future. This task find understanding and support in the German academic environment. The inevitability of the reforms and the novelty of the tasks facing the society force German teachers, psychologists, sociologists, politicians to closely follow the process of the Bologna process in Germany. The relevance of this topic has stimulated the emergence of a sufficiently large number of critical publications dealing with the creation of a common European scientific and educational space [1]; problems of preserving the principle of the scientific nature of European education [2]; introducing new forms of education into the university reality [3]; creating new structures of university education [4]; inculcation of a specific set of competencies in young professionals [5]; prospects of the implementation of educational reforms in Germany universities [6]. The works of German scientists also reflected the implementation of the quality standards of university education [7], [9]; the implementation of various software educational concepts at German universities [8]; perceptions of the Bologna reform in German employer circles [10]; professionalization of German university education [11]; determination of the nature of modern university education and its goals [12]. But a rather detailed mapping of various aspects of the reform of the German university education neglects the need of ensuring the anthropologization and humanization of university education and university science, which is the key to successful transformations in this area.

Purpose of the article. The purpose of this study is to

compile and systematize data on the implementation of the Bologna process in Germany, which are of interest to Ukrainian specialists, politicians, officials and teachers and will allow them to make certain adjustments to the national strategy for implementing the program provisions of the Bologna process. Achieving this purpose involves the following tasks: 1) to outline the range of problems facing the sphere of German higher education at this stage of its reforming; 2) to identify the shortcomings of reforming German universities; 3) to offer an own vision of solutions of existing problems in the field of university education.

Presentation of the main material. As mentioned above, the main problem of reforming the field of university education in Germany, German scientists see in the absence of adequate funding, which leads to shifting the problems on the shoulders of universities themselves and their employees. The reform process is complicated by the fact that German universities often show unnecessary perfectionism in the implementation of reforms, which is manifested in «duplication of measures» [9, 25]. These measures are carried out in those areas of university reform that have already exhausted their reform potential and require additional financial costs for the state to restore it or renew it. This forces university staff that previously fundamentally supported the implementation of reforms in the framework of the Bologna process or was more than restrained in their efforts to search for ways to minimize the costs caused by its intensified and non-rational boost.

The progress of the reforms, the main motto of which was the introduction of the procedure of external and internal accreditation of universities and a unified system of assessing academic progress of students, led to further bureaucratization of universities, but not to improving the quality of university education, which is the main goal of the reform. In addition, the increased and sometimes rather absurd demands of higher authorities placed on universities and their staff caused a consolidation of supporters and opponents of the reforms, who joined together to resist the imaginary reforms. As the reasoned criticism of decisions made by federal and land ministries and departments intensifies in the academic environment, a professional discussion of these decisions and their possible consequences takes place. As the discussion proceeds, the implementation of odious decisions made by higher authorities is hampered.

The answer to the verbal and practical opposition to measures taken by federal and land ministries and departments was the development of a number of instructions for universities, formulated and approved at the regularly held Conference of Ministers of Education. These instructions were by their nature political decisions that acquired legal force through their implementation into land legislation. Adopted by the Conference of Ministers of Education these decisions contributed to the unification of the reform activities of universities, but did not identify the sources of additional funding necessary for universities to carry out the planned reforms. These reforms exacerbated the problems existing in the field of German university education, and also led to the emergence of new ones. These problems include: 1) a marked decline of the teaching and research quality at German universities; 2) strengthening the bureaucratization of universities in the context of the introduction of expensive and inefficient, according to German specialists, procedures for the implementation of internal and external accreditation; 3) increasing the academic load of students and reducing their individual space for professional and personal development, as well as for forming a broad scientific outlook of young specialists; 4) the outflow of highly qualified specialists (teachers and scientists) out off the field of university education to other activity fields; 5) averaging the quality of professional training of teachers, scientists and students; 6) destructing the basic principle of academic education due to the accentuation of imparting core competencies to students instead of scientific competence.

In addition, the modularization of the educational process

caused the loss of the opportunity to study at the university in accordance with students' individual curriculum, taking into account their individual educational needs and priorities. The new curriculums of the 3-year period of study at the undergraduate program, squeezed into a fairly rigid framework of the credit-modular system, have virtually eliminated the possibility for students to do practical work and study at other universities, including abroad. The German teachers had the impression that the authors of manuals on the modularization of educational material clearly overdone the development of instructions for German universities, which contained all the known and supposed goals of professional training of specialists. Training programs that imply the achievement of 500 or even 800 goals of professional training of young specialists, cause bewilderment among the majority of the universities' teaching staff [4, p. 76]. Of course, this fact shows not only the opportunism of some officials and executors of the reform plans, but also their insufficient competence level, since the expediency of choosing individual priority objectives of the educational process and simultaneously ignoring the remaining secondary ones is obvious [4].

One of the goals listed in these curricula is to inculcate the «labour market» competitiveness to university graduates. An excessive accentuation of this competence caused an unwarranted focussing undergraduate study programs on professional suitability of young professionals in the labour market. The postulate on the professional suitability of bachelors in individual study programs that presupposes an early specialization of training, for example, in medicine, law, engineering, pedagogy and theology, creates insurmountable barriers for students for a successful professional career. This is due to the fact that the bachelor's training course, compressed to three years of training, causes considerable caution to employers, since they cannot entrust the bachelors with a fairly wide range of duties as a doctor, teacher, or lawyer. These duties, according to German employers, can be performed only by persons with complete higher education.

The goal of the Bologna process, which is to create conditions for increasing the international mobility of students through the introduction of a phased university education system, the modularization of the educational process and the introduction of ECTS, has not been achieved yet. The promised facilitation of interregional and international recognition of student academic achievement has not occurred. Measures aimed at ensuring international comparability of diplomas and grades have led to the development of curricula that cannot be compared even at the interregional level in Germany.

In general, the following results of the reform can be summarized: the universities and their structural units implemented the planned reforms formally by introducing a two-stage gradual training system, modularization, the ECTS, accreditation, and unified documents confirming the academic performance of students. Analysis of the scientific works of German scientists devoted to the problems of reforming universities allows concluding that there are significant discrepancies in the assessments of the three main groups of specialists who have a different vision of the prospects of the German university education development. These groups are 1) adherents of the Humboldt model of university education, 2) supporters of the universal educational idea and 3) supporters of the university education marketization.

Humboldtians (conservatives) and Universalists (supporters of providing equal educational opportunities for all members of society) perceive «competitiveness in the labour market» as a kind of «professional suitability», that is, the ability of specialists to perform their work within a limited remit. Humboldtians and supporters of the idea of introducing market principles into the field of university education (liberals) support the «particularistic» understanding of education: they perceive individuals as citizens, «who have the freedom of self-development, have certain talents, but at the same time have significant resistance to receive education,

first of all, due to the lack of necessary academic abilities» [6, p. 19].

According to P. Pasternack, the course of the Bologna process in Germany is similar in some form to the implementation of the project of a multidisciplinary higher educational institution in the 1970 s. As in those years, the modern reformers have different motivations, diametrically opposite visions of problems and pursue different goals at the current stage of university education reforming. The practical benefits of implementing the program provisions of the Bologna declaration are visible only in general terms and are hardly predictable. A particular academic mentality is not very compatible with the mentality of politicians, and the planned activities face the problem of insufficient funding.

However, there is one important difference between the plans of implementing the model of a multidisciplinary higher education institution and the Bologna process. A multidisciplinary university was originally a project aimed at widespread implementation, just like the Bologna process. The first was implemented pointwise both in content and in the form, that is, at several higher educational institutions. The Bologna process, on the contrary, is formally implemented everywhere, although pointwise in its content. Such a comparison makes it possible to realistically assess the chances of implementing the Bologna process. The new form, filled with still old content, can be adapted to reformed structures without great expense by rejecting all that hinders the creation of powerful and effective universities, and by preserving all that seems useful.

Therefore, the urgent task of reforming German universities is to eliminate a number of negative consequences of curriculum reform. These include: 1) too small fragmentation of educational material into modules, 2) unnecessarily detailed instructions on the sequence of implementation of modules, 3) a large amount of verification activities, 4) the inability of students to individually select the speed of educational material mastering, 5) excessive specialization of training programs, on the one hand, and too extensive interdisciplinary connections in curricula, on the other hand [3]. Eliminating these shortcomings can compensate for the loss in the quality of German university education.

The obviousness of their removal made the participants of the Conference of Education Ministers, held in 2009, to put on the agenda the question of the adequacy of the new curricula content for training young specialists in the framework of two-stage training. Conference participants came to the conclusion, that curricula for some specialties introduced at the initial stage of reforms are not in demand in the educational services' market. In addition, at its meeting in 2012, the Scientific Council, a collegial body representing the German scientific community, formulated a new topical task for universities: improving the quality of university education by reforming the learning process and filling it with new content.

Whether this happens in the short term depends on the formation of an adequate balance between scientific and professional training young specialists at German universities, as well as on the realization of an optimal balance between research activities of universities and the organization of the educational process. Studying at an university that does not correlate with the culture of the scientific knowledge production calls into question the very essence of university education. In the traditional sense, a professional should recognize the causal relationships between events, separate the essential from the insignificant, analyse solutions, outline the best ways to solve problems, draw up the order of execution of decisions made and manage the process of their implementation.

In order to acquire the ability to make such complex decisions related to the risk to surrounding people and society as a whole, students must develop a competence based on scientific knowledge, i.e. have a broad scientific outlook and use a certain methodology for critical assessment of the situation, making decisions and determining priorities. The

purpose of obtaining a university education is the acquisition of scientific competence and competences based on it. Therefore, only preparation for participation in competitive labour market and the inculcation of social and communicative competencies (meaning conflict management skills, communication skills, etc.) in this situation are clearly insufficient measures.

It is the unity of research and study in higher education that serves the purpose of training professionals beyond the framework of all disputes that are currently taking place around the «idea of the university». A closer look at the nature of key competencies that determine the availability of professional competence (critical and analytical intelligence, the ability to argue, the ability to work and learn independently, the ability to solve problems and decision-making, planning, coordination, management skills, ability to cooperate, etc.) allows to conclude that the traditional Humboldt virtues of mutual fertilization of research and teaching are surprisingly relevant even with the perspective willow today [1, p. 41].

Despite the exaggerated emphasis on the principle of «unity of research and learning», there is a growing awareness of the relationship of research and learning, with which students are, inculcated «spiritual needs and intellectual discipline necessary in research practice» [1, p. 39]. It is important that the ongoing reforms do not destroy this important link, but strengthen it in every way.

Successful promotion of higher education reforms in Germany requires a realistic assessment of the situation in the field of university education and science, the widespread approval of changes in which must be reflected in a reformed academic culture and suggest a change of generations of scientists and teachers that cannot come quickly. Therefore, a more realistic way of reforming the university education system is to expand the circle of reform advocates, which is one of the most important and difficult tasks of this stage of transformation.

Conclusions. The problems of reforming the sphere of German university education arise not so much because of insufficient funding of this sphere by the German state or due to the lack of political will in the implementation of reforms. The need for their implementation does not cause doubts in the German academic environment and German society. The German academic community is also aware of the need to develop and introduce a new paradigm of university education, which also does not exclude the emergence of new problems, primarily because of the complexity of the modern stage of civilization development, which very quickly changes the nature of university education and presents to it more and more new and high requirements. The Internet community, which has arisen under the influence of the rapid development of communication and information technologies, contributes to a significant increase in each individual's access to knowledge and information, and also makes it possible to diversify the development of individual and creative abilities and meet the most diverse educational needs of people. In the field of university education, there is a need for the development and implementation of new forms of education, built on a personality-oriented approach, as well as the need for the active use of tools and opportunities for distance learning and information support of the educational process.

Under the conditions of the Bologna reform, technocratic in its nature, the German and the rest of European universities confront, on the one hand, with the threat of their «death» as institutions or, at least, confront with the threat of their transformation into translators of no longer relevant and fragmented knowledge. On the other hand, there is also the danger of the university becoming a factory, which produces educational products with predetermined properties that international corporations are interested in. To prevent all these threats, universities and the whole society should take into account the fact that the complication of the modern world leads to the complication of the process of knowledge production, requires the application of new approaches

to the organization of university education based on anthropologization of educational and research process and on discursiveness knowledge, the main characteristics of which are its variability, fluidity, inconsistency and heterogeneity. The rejection of linearity and reproduction in education also implies the rejection of «ready-made» knowledge. On the contrary, the task of educational process participants, the students and the teachers as its subjects, asserts joint search and joint creation knowledge, which does not contradict the neo-humanistic concept of German university education, authored by W. von Humboldt. This concept means active participation of teachers and students in acquiring knowledge, which becomes what it is, in the process of searching for truth.

REFERENCES:

1. Bourgeois E. *Zukunftsforschung zur Entwicklung der Beziehungen zwischen Hochschulausbildung und Forschung mit Blick auf den Europäischen Forschungsraum. Europäischen Kommission / Generaldirektion Forschung, Luxemburg, 2002.*
2. Demirović A. *Wissenschaft oder Dummheit? Über die Zerstörung der Rationalität in den Bildungsinstitutionen. (Science or stupidity? About the destruction of rationality in educational institutions.) // Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung. VSA: Verlag, Hamburg, 2015.*
3. Haertel T., Schneider R. & J. Wildt. *Editorial: Wie kommt das Neue in die Hochschule? (How does the new come in higher education institutions?) ZFHE Jg.6 / Nr.3 (Oktober 2011) S. I–IX. URL: //www.zfhe.at/index.php/zfhe/issue/view/30.*
4. Hechler D., Pasternack P. *Bologna: Zentral- und Sonderaspekte // Zur anstehenden Reparaturphase der Studienstrukturreform. In: die hochschule 2/2009. Institut für Hochschulforschung (HoF), Halle-Wittenberg, 2009. S. 6–17.*
5. Keil J., Pasternack P. *Frühpädagogisch kompetent. Kompetenzorientierung in Qualifikationsrahmen und Ausbildungsprogrammen der Frühpädagogik. Institut für Hochschulforschung (HoF), Halle-Wittenberg, 2009.*
6. Lenhardt G. *Europäische und deutsche Perspektiven der Hochschulpolitik. S. 17–28. In: die hochschule 2 / 2004.*
7. Pasternack P. *Qualitätsstandards für Hochschulreformen // Eine Auswertung der deutschen Hochschulreformqualitäten in den letzten zwei Jahrzehnten. (Quality standards for higher education reforms. An evaluation of the German higher education reform qualities in the last two decades.) UniversitätsVerlagWebler. Bielefeld, 2014.*
8. Pasternack P., Wissel von, C. *Programmatische Konzepte der Hochschulentwicklung in Deutschland seit 1945. (Programmatic concepts of university development in Germany since 1945.) // Hans-Böckler-Stiftung. Düsseldorf, 2010.*
9. Pellert A. *Hochschule und Qualität (Higher educational institution and quality) // In: Thomas Reil / Martin Winter (Hg.). Qualitätssicherung an Hochschulen: Theorie und Praxis. W. Bertelsmann Verlag, Bielefeld, 2002. S. 21–29.*
10. Rehbarg M. *Hochschulreform und Arbeitsmarkt. Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung Universität Kassel (Higher education reform and the labor market. Scientific Center for Vocational and Higher Education Research University of Kassel.) // Bonner Universitäts-Druckerei, 2006. 242 S.*
11. Reisz R. D., Stock M. *Wandel der Hochschulbildung in Deutschland und Professionalisierung (HoF-Arbeitsbericht 6 2011) // Hrsg. vom Institut für Hochschulforschung (HoF) an der Martin-Luther-Universität. Halle-Wittenberg 2011.*
12. Splett J. *Im Dienst akademischer Bildung – Universität: der Ort, der Wissenschaft und Weisheit? (In the service of academic education – University: the place of science and wisdom?) S. 2–26. In: AemaetWissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie. URL://aemaet.de.ISSN2195-173X aemaet 6 (2017) 2–27, http://aemaet.de/urn:nbn:de:0288-20130928810*