

рольових ігор, кейс-методу, диспутів, студентських конференцій, олімпіад дозволяє створити в навчальній аудиторії атмосферу освітнього спілкування, відкритості, взаємодією учасників на рівних правах. Це дозволяє забезпечити високу мотивацію, міцність знань, розвиток творчості, комунікабельності, зберегти активну життєву позицію, індивідуальність, свободу самовираження, взаємоповагу і демократичність.

Таким чином, розвиток СЕВ у студентів-медиків проявляється як стрес-реакція на емоційно-напружену навчальну і комунікативну діяльність у вигляді поступового наростання окремих психо-вегетативних і психологічних симптомів та свідчить про порушення їх соціально-психологічної адаптації. Використання інтерактивних методів навчання з метою профілактики та корекції порушення «емоційного вигорання» дозволяє в процесі навчання знімати нервово-емоційне та психічне напруження у студентів, дає можливість змінювати форми їх діяльності, перемикає увагу на ключове питання заняття, сприяє розвитку комунікативних умінь і навичок майбутнього фахівця, нівелює негативний вплив «кризи третього курсу».

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Богданова, І. М. Використання інтерактивних технологій у підготовці майбутніх-соціал-них працівників // Вісник Національної академії Державної прикорд. служби України. Педагогічні науки. - 2011. - № 11. - С. 15-20.
2. Бойко В.В. Методика діагностики рівня емоційного вигорання // "Практическая психодиагностика", ред. Райгородського Д.Я., Самара: Видавничий дім «Бахрах-М», 2008.- 672 с.
3. Дяченко, М.І. Психологія вищої школи. / М.І. Дьяченко, Л.А. Кандибович, С.Л. Кандибович. - Мінськ: Харвест, 2006. - 416 с
4. Столяренко, Л.Д. Основи психології. / Л.Д. Столяренко. - Ростов-на-Дону: Фенікс, 2013. - 672 с.

UDC 811.161.2.

Piotr T. Nowakowski

The University of Rzeszów, Poland

DEONTOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON ACADEMIC COLLABORATION IN POLAND

The author conducted deontological deliberations concerning collaboration among academic workers in the reality of Polish universities. In the view of potential irregularities that threaten this cooperation, it has been investigated what answer is brought in this regard by the ethical codes of universities but also how this problem is perceived by the students who tend to be critical and keen observers. As far as codification is concerned of standards related to the issue in question, Polish academic environment is not in a bad condition. It seems that the problem has been noticed. However, when those documents are perceived as a collection of not so much written, but rather actually recognized values, then the quoted remarks of the students would prove that there is more work to be performed in this respect, which should be deepened under studies of quantitative and qualitative nature. One clear conclusion is drawn from the performed analyses. Namely undermining the authority of one academic by another – in particular in the eyes of the students – results not only in weakening the authority of the humiliated person but mainly of the humiliating individual. Moreover, it contributes to straining the authority of an academic as such.

Key words: *academic worker, academic community, intra-academic collaboration, academic ethical code, academic deontology*

Autor przeprowadził rozważania deontologiczne dotyczące współpracy między pracownikami akademickimi w realiach polskich uczelni. W obliczu potencjalnych nieprawidłowości, na jakie narażona jest ta współpraca, przyjrano się, jaką odpowiedź przynoszą w tym względzie uczelniane kodeksy etyczne, ale i jak ten problem jest percypowany przez studentów, którzy bywają krytycznymi i spostrzegawczymi obserwatorami. Jeśli chodzi o kodyfikację norm dotyczących interesującego nas zagadnienia, nie jest w polskim środowisku akademickim źle. Wydaje się, że problem został dostrzeżony. Gdy jednak spojrzeć na owe dokumenty jako na zbiór nie tyle spisanych, co faktycznie uznawanych wartości, wówczas przytoczone uwagi studentów świadczyłyby, że jest w tym względzie jeszcze praca do wykonania, co wypadaloby pogłębić w badaniach o charakterze ilościowo-jakościowym. Jeden jasny wniosek wynika z przeprowadzonych analiz. Otóż obniżanie autorytetu jednego pracownika akademickiego przez drugiego, zwłaszcza na oczach studentów, skutkuje nie tyle podważeniem autorytetu osoby poniżanej, co przede wszystkim osoby poniżającej, ponadto przyczynia się do nadwężenia autorytetu uczonego jako takiego.

Słowa kluczowe: *pracownik akademicki, środowisko akademickie, współpraca wewnątrzakademicka, akademicki kodeks etyczny, deontologia akademicka*

If the Polish public is confronted with the ethical assessments of collaboration among the academics, this often happens within the context of the publicized irregularities, such as the incidents of infringement of copyrights (Rewera 2011, p. 209-12), nepotism (Hołdyńska 2014, p. A8), defrauding research funds (Filipiak 2013, p. A10), conflicts undermining the academic community ([wap] 2008), mobbing, as indicated among others in the book by Józef Wieczorek (2009), or the problem of feudalization of the Polish academic world (Szadkowski 2015, p. XV), sometimes adopting a form of a systemic network of fraudulent relations and connections whose prime power – as Jadwiga Michalczyk writes (2004, p. 39) – is “mutual support and concealing chicanery, affairs and other deceptions”. Referring to the signals pointing to the irregularities in the academic world (“A plagiarism here, some fiction there, with some unreliability or outright lie on top of that”), she asks about the motivation for tolerating dishonesty: “solidarity of community or solidarity of traitors? A demand, maybe? Immorality is not incidental. A single academic cheater would do little harm: with the honesty of others, their deceit would be promptly exposed. The immorality then must be linked to bigger or smaller communities. Therefore this is the most alarming phenomenon which bears the hallmarks of crisis of academia” (Michalczyk 2004, p. 39). In the view of potential irregularities threatening the intra-academic collaboration, it is becoming to take a closer look at how this challenge is dealt with by the universities’ ethical codes, but also how the phenomenon is perceived by the students, who happen to be critical and keen observers. Hence, this paper further is the effect of a thorough preliminary research of digitalized academic documents, as well as surveys aiming at obtaining empirical data.

Deontological documents perspective. One of the reactions to the challenges faced by the academic community is the activity of the individual universities in defining ethical canons declared as socially accepted in a given community. Basing on the analysis of their content I have selected six areas that are sensitive for the collaboration between researchers. I am going to present them, providing illustrations coming from academic codes. It should be added that some of the aspects have appeared in several documents, sometimes repeated with exactly the same wording, therefore, in order to

make my disquisition well-put-together and clear, I am reducing the number of the sources indicated in brackets:

– Respect for the dignity of colleagues. The ethical codes of universities, among other things, point out the recommendation for the academic work to be directed with “the principles of kindness and friendliness in contacts with [...] colleagues” and to avoid “all forms of inappropriate treating [...] other academics” (Kodeks etyki studenta i pracownika Wyższej Szkoły Biznesu w Pile 2017, sect. III.2) and “actions that could hurt people, their reputation, and career” (Kodeks etyki pracowników Politechniki Wrocławskiej 2016, sect. 1.6). In this light, the authors of Code of ethics for research workers emphasize that “all forms of oppression and discrimination against [...] co-workers [...] are reprehensible” (Kodeks etyki pracownika naukowego 2017, sect. 4.2) and “the health, safety or welfare of a community or of collaborators should not be compromised” (Kodeks etyki pracownika naukowego 2017, sect. 3.2.5).

– Concern about good relations in the community. An academic “acts in a manner favorable to the strengthening of the professional collaboration and good relations with others” (Kodeks etyki nauczyciela akademickiego 2016, sect. 7), “cares for good human relations at the university as well as prevents conflicts in the community” (Kodeks etyki nauczyciela akademickiego Akademii Pomorskiej w Słupsku 2011, § 21), is driven by “friendliness and common loyalty” (Kodeks etyki pracowników Politechniki Wrocławskiej 2016, sect. 1.5) and “develops lasting relations, thanks to which one becomes a reliable partner both internally and outside the university” (Kodeks etyki Wyższej Szkoły Przedsiębiorczości i Administracji w Lublinie 2017, p. 4). Academic code of values adopted by the Senate of the Jagiellonian University also encourages to “create an atmosphere of good work which releases energy and enthusiasm in all the participants of the academic life, free from petty-mindedness, discouraging criticism, competitive haste and sham of meaningful activity” (Akademicki kodeks wartości 2003, sect. 3).

– Righteous approach towards colleagues. It is often emphasized that an academic, in their profession, should be distinguished with honesty in relation to their colleagues and the academic community (Kodeks etyki nauczyciela akademickiego 2016, sect. 4) as well as to oppose – lawfully and in a cultural manner – “dishonesty, unreliability, intolerance, injustice and other manifestations of unethical conduct of professionals” (Kodeks etyki nauczyciela akademickiego Wyższej Szkoły Informatyki i Ekonomii Towarzystwa Wiedzy Powszechnej w Olsztynie 2013, § 17). One should be “guided with righteousness and objectivism when acknowledging the academic achievements of other researchers, colleagues and predecessors” (Kodeks etyki pracowników Politechniki Wrocławskiej 2016, sect. 2.2.6), and in assessment of research undertakings, the guideline should be the academic conscience: “across the societal divides, friends’ relations and any non-professional emotions and feelings – personal, national and related to the worldviews” (Akademicki kodeks wartości 2003, sect. 1).

– Partnership in action. As it is pointed out in the Academic code of values of the Jagiellonian University, concern should be exercised with regard to the consistent distribution of duties so that they are “not becoming an excessive burden for one group, while being an unjustified privilege for another – usually benefiting from those inequalities in order to undertake additional classes outside of their main university” (Akademicki kodeks wartości 2003, sect. 4). On the other hand, Code of ethics of the University College of Enterprise and Administration in Lublin calls for an academic to participate “in the work of task groups if asked by a colleague, regardless of their

position in the organizational structure” (Kodeks etyki Wyższej Szkoły Przedsiębiorczości i Administracji w Lublinie 2017, p. 4). In a sense, this category also encompasses a call for “not shirking participation in the work of a committee and collegium bodies” (Kodeks etyki pracowników Politechniki Wrocławskiej 2016, sect. 1.12).

– Giving support to colleagues. An academic should “inspire and develop creativity of their colleagues [...], support their academic achievements as well as provide assistance with own knowledge and professional attention” (Kodeks etyki nauczyciela akademickiego Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego 2007, § 34), also “care for a proper development of the teaching staff and constantly work on enriching and improving their research and teaching skills” (Akademicki kodeks etyczny Politechniki Śląskiej 2004, sect. 5). Some codes draw attention to young research staff, calling for an academic teacher to be “a friendly tutor and teacher [...] of the junior research workers” (Akademicki kodeks etyczny Akademii Górniczo-Hutniczej 2003, sect. 4), also “a friendly yet demanding tutor of new academics, who cares about their development” (Akademicki kodeks etyczny Politechniki Krakowskiej im. Tadeusza Kościuszki 2003, sect. 10).

– Obeying the principles of co-authorship. What is meant here is the fair division of the intellectual property in relation to colleagues (Akademicki kodeks etyczny Politechniki Śląskiej 2004, sect. 4), including honest principles of determining the co-authorship of a publication (Kodeks etyki nauczyciela akademickiego Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego 2007, § 35). The code of ethics for an academic teacher of Pomeranian University in Słupsk provides the following explanation: “An academic takes care that the recognition for scientific achievements was received by those with whom it really belongs. Offering an unjustified co-authorship or giving authorship of a research work to a different person, accepting a waived authorship, and especially demanding giving up an authorship are unacceptable” (Kodeks etyki nauczyciela akademickiego Akademii Pomorskiej w Słupsku 2011, § 30). As the Academic code of values of the Jagiellonian University reads, it is not only the problem of a “bold adding one’s name to the effects of somebody else’s work”, but also “suggesting a co-authorship share which is higher than it actually was” (Akademicki kodeks wartości 2003, sect. 8).

Among all the documents, Ethical code of Karol Adamiecki Academy of Economics in Katowice (now it operates as the University of Economics in Katowice) relates in the most exhausting manner to the ethical responsibility of the academics towards their colleagues. To obtain a wider context and to complement the above remarks, let us quote its extensive fragments at this point: “An academic should follow the principles of kindness, loyalty and friendliness in relation to their colleagues. In professional contacts demonstrate mutual respect, help with advice and assistance. [...] An academic, caring for continuous development of their skills and knowledge, aims at perfecting the professional environment and education quality at the University of Economics and supports their colleagues, especially subordinates, in developing professional competences. [...] An academic, respecting achievements of their colleagues, when exchanging professional opinions, should use substantive reasoning both in relation to superiors and subordinates. [...] In case of noticing somebody’s wrong action, an academic teacher should react. At the same time they should not criticize in public the professional activity of another teacher. It is rebukable to groundlessly present a colleague in bad light, exposing them to loss of respect, reduction of their salary or removal from the position held or undeserved omission in promotion. [...] An academic

should adopt an attitude of friendly criticism towards the work and conceptions of other authors, connected with self-criticism and towards own research work. [...] An academic is obliged to be loyal towards their colleagues working within the same department and to refrain from activities that would infringe such loyalty also after termination of the collaboration, as well as they should react in case of violation of the ethical principles by their colleagues. [...] An academic must not demand from their colleagues or subordinates behavior that is in contradiction with the values of the University of Economics code” (Kodeks etyczny Akademii Ekonomicznej im. Karola Adamieckiego w Katowicach 2009, chapt. 4, sect. 1-6, 8).

Students’ perspective. In the next step we will take a closer look at how the collaboration between the academics is perceived by Polish students. We will use for that the survey answers gathered during research that have been performed since 2008 with the use of snowball sampling. In general more than two thousand respondents have been asked to provide examples – with a short description and justification – of the observed or experienced unethical and ethical behavior of the academic workers. The survey questionnaire contained open questions serving extending the knowledge concerning the undertaken issue, and the study itself was of qualitative nature, as the purpose was not so much to specify the frequency of occurrence of individual attitudes, as primarily to classify them, interpret and evaluate. As a result of the performed survey, I have received information which was diverse with respect to its content, concerning the conduct of academic employees. Most of this data has been already published, following appropriate processing, in scientific journals. Namely, it is about considerations on an academic as a knowledge purveyor (Nowakowski 2010, p. 487-95), or as an examiner (Nowakowski 2008, p. 77-84; 2009, p. 103-12), and considerations undertaken in wider contexts (e.g., Nowakowski 2007, p. 547-56). The issue of collaboration between the academic workers surfaced in a way on the side of the performed research which does not mean that it should be assessed as insignificant from the perspective of the students. On the contrary – although the respondents were not asked directly, this issue must be evident since some of them decided it should be mentioned. First, let us relate to the negative aspects of academics’ attitude, then to the positive ones.

The problems that are most frequently recalled by the surveyed in this respect are open challenging the authority of other academics, speaking of them in a disrespectful manner, making inappropriate remarks about them, making fun in front of the students, negative evaluation of their achievements. “My dear ones, there no point going to those lectures, it’s just a waste of time. This lady has nothing interesting to say” – this is a statement of one of the PhD’s who conducted lessons complementing to the lectures he was criticizing. This lack of respect for colleagues is directed upwards the university hierarchy (“a PhD lecturer sneers about his university colleagues and spits before uttering their professor title”) or downwards this hierarchy (a statement of one of the professors: “any little PhD means nothing to me”). One of the respondents noticed that such attitude leads nowhere and even results in a kind of a boomerang effect. She illustrated it with an example of a doctor who “undermined the knowledge presented by other university employees. He criticized their methods of work, which was negatively received by the students. At times when students referred to statements of other lecturers, the doctor concerned ironically negated this information. His ways were so unethical that students did not trust him”. Another respondent attempted at disclosing the motivations behind the discussed attitude: “A conclusion can be drawn that university teachers have a strong need of proving they are right and highly competent by means of criticizing the skills of

other people”. Another questioned person openly declared that she did not like the fact “the professors deal with their issues involving students in it”. One more suggested that “comments on colleagues should not be stated in front of the students; such remarks are to be made directly to the person concerned”, which is also supported by the statement that such behavior undermines the reliability of the university: “Even if an academic does not perform well, another lecturer should reprove them in person rather than ridicule during their own lecture. Students have little to say anyway and such behavior results in increased dislike towards the university” – concludes one of the respondents.

Students also emphasize unfriendly approach to other (i.e., not teaching) staff of a university. “An academic with a PhD degree gave to understand (very bluntly) – especially to the administration staff – about his position in the university. He approached them with arrogance and simply humiliated them” – reads the survey. Another response tells us a story of a friendship of two academics, which could not stand a test at one point: “The two ladies came to work at the same time. They became very close friends. One of them worked in the dean’s office all the time, while the other pursued a developing career. Today the former one still holds a master’s degree, the latter – a doctor’s. And suddenly the doctor is ashamed of the friendship. She starts to avoid her former best friend in the corridor. She is upset when the other calls her by her first name. She regards herself as somebody superior”.

Another important problem is impeding research, especially to the younger researchers. One of the students points at “hindering the development of young academics and taking away their achievements by the professors”. Another respondent additionally writes about “a groundless removal from a department manager function a person thanks to whom the department has become one of the best developing units in the Institute of Physics”. A daring diagnosis of the situation emerged in one academic institution: “For the students to see, a specific fight was taking place for the influence in the university”.

The surveyed also included in their responses cases of making unethical pressure in the environment of academic teachers. A mention was made, among others, about “a university teacher’s attempt to interfere into a grade given to a student by another teacher”. A specific example was given, when a person supervising apprenticeship tried to influence the apprentice tutor to lower somebody’s grade. As the surveyed individual suggests, it reportedly resulted from the personal aversion of the staff member to the student.

When talking about university teachers’ positive attitude, we must first of all mention their friendly approach to other staff – not only the academics but also administration and maintenance employees. One of the students observed that “the professors treat with dignity persons who work in the institution. They do not swagger with their position and education. They approach others with respect and there is friendly atmosphere among them”. Another respondent recalls the following to illustrate this type of attitude: “One day, while going to the university I saw the professor pick up some papers from the ground and throw them into the garbage. Moreover, he helped the cleaning lady to move the garbage bin. That was a nice surprise to me as I had never seen such an ordinary human reaction from people working in the university. Help to other people, those who are lower in the hierarchy”. The students also appreciate attempts made by the teachers of increasing the authority of colleagues, e.g., by means of “appreciating by a lecturer the work of other employees of the university and referring to their individual work”.

Another category are the cases when an academic intervenes with regard to their colleagues – in the name of properly understood wellbeing of the students. One of the respondents presents a problem of a lecturer who harassed browbeaten female students (groping, making dates). “Our year tutor did not refuse us help when we turned to her with the above mentioned problem. She believed us and not her colleague. She sided with us and thanks to her the doctor lost the right to practice his profession” – she writes. Another one remembers a reaction of a year tutor who – when informed that a teacher fails his students at tests or exams not because they did not have the knowledge but for non-essential reasons – had a firm conversation with him and stated that students are also human. “They have the same feelings, ambitions and human dignity and being a professor does not authorize to humiliate other people; on the contrary: it provides the opportunity of enriching them” – adds the respondent. Certainly a situation when an academic stands by a student, risking provoking or escalating a conflict with their colleague, is highly uncomfortable. In some cases, however, it seems unavoidable.

Conclusions. The performed analyses reveal that the documents formulated in the academic environment, of deontological nature, raise the issue of relations among academic staff, although it does not take as much space as other issues. Similarly like in case of the survey responses of students who – according to the rule that: “blood is thicker than water” – wrote much more about, e.g., ethical aspects of execution of exams or lectures at the university, occasionally referring to the issue of relations between the academic workers. Nevertheless, specific words and examples have been cited by the students and, moreover, they correlate with a part of the theses included in the mentioned codes. It concerns the relations prevailing in the academic community, righteous approach towards colleagues, and primarily – respecting their dignity, which harmonizes with the demand expressed by the authors of Academic code of values adopted by the Senate of the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, which states that dignity is not a privilege of any selected social group. “Equal right to it is with both a great and famous professor and a humble assistant and student. In the academic community, dignity should be taken care of not only of a scholar but also of a secretary, librarian, warehouse crew, or a cleaning lady” – reads the document (Akademicki kodeks wartości 2003, sect. 10).

As far as codification is concerned of standards related to the issue in question, Polish academic environment is not in a bad condition. Regardless whether the issue has been addressed with just one sentence or a couple of paragraphs, it seems that the problem has been actually noticed. However, if we look at the documents from a wider perspective: as a collection of not so much written-down but actually acknowledged values, then the formerly quoted remarks of the students would be the evidence, that some work still needs to be done in this field. How much work? This question could be answered in some further, in-depth research of quantitative and qualitative nature. This article is only to signal the problem. Nevertheless, one very clear conclusion can be drawn from the above analyses: diminishing the authority of one academic by another, for the students to see, against the intentions of the wrongdoer results not so much in challenging the authority of the humiliated person, but mainly – of the humiliating individual, and under an even more pessimistic scenario – contributes to impairing the authority of the institution of a scholar. And this truth cannot be learned from reading a raw text of deontological codes, but rather from the illustrative narrative of the students.

REFERENCES

1. Akademicki kodeks etyczny Akademii Górniczo-Hutniczej (2003), Akademia Górniczo-Hutnicza, Kraków.

2. Akademicki kodeks etyczny Politechniki Krakowskiej im. Tadeusza Kościuszki (2003), Politechnika Krakowska, Kraków.
3. Akademicki kodeks etyczny Politechniki Śląskiej (2004), Politechnika Śląska, Gliwice.
4. Akademicki kodeks wartości przyjęty na posiedzeniu Senatu Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w dniu 25 czerwca 2003 roku (2003), Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków.
5. Filipiak J. (2013), Uczelnie marnują dotacje, interviewed by S. Czubkowska, "Dziennik Gazeta Prawna", no. 212, p. A10.
6. Holdyńska E. (2014), Rodziny wciąż rządzą uczelniami, "Rzeczpospolita", no. 8, p. A8.
7. Kodeks etyczny Akademii Ekonomicznej im. Karola Adamieckiego w Katowicach (2009), Akademia Ekonomiczna im. Karola Adamieckiego, Katowice.
8. Kodeks etyki nauczyciela akademickiego (2016), Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa im. Prezydenta Stanisława Wojciechowskiego, Kalisz.
9. Kodeks etyki nauczyciela akademickiego Akademii Pomorskiej w Słupsku (2011), Akademia Pomorska, Słupsk.
10. Kodeks etyki nauczyciela akademickiego Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego (2007), Uniwersytet Gdański, Gdańsk.
11. Kodeks etyki nauczyciela akademickiego Wyższej Szkoły Informatyki i Ekonomii Towarzystwa Wiedzy Powszechnej w Olsztynie (2013), Wyższa Szkoła Informatyki i Ekonomii Towarzystwa Wiedzy Powszechnej, Olsztyn.
12. Kodeks etyki pracownika naukowego (2017), Komisja ds. Etyki w Nauce PAN, Warszawa.
13. Kodeks etyki pracowników Politechniki Wrocławskiej (2016), Politechnika Wroclawska, Wrocław.
14. Kodeks etyki studenta i pracownika Wyższej Szkoły Biznesu w Pile (2017), Wyższa Szkoła Biznesu, Pila.
15. Kodeks etyki Wyższej Szkoły Przedsiębiorczości i Administracji w Lublinie (2017), Wyższa Szkoła Przedsiębiorczości i Administracji, Lublin.
16. Michalczyk J. (2004), Zamknięte "oczy świata", "Forum Akademickie", no. 2, p. 39.
17. Nowakowski P.T. (2007), Trabajo del profesorado universitario según lo evalúan los estudiantes, "Educação", vol. 30, no. 3 (63), p. 547-56.
18. Nowakowski P.T. (2008), Etyczne aspekty przeprowadzania kolokwium i egzaminów, "Nauczyciel i Szkoła", no. 1/2 (38/39), p. 77-84.
19. Nowakowski P.T. (2009), Aspectos éticos en la verificación de los conocimientos de los estudiantes. El contexto polaco, "Yachay", vol. 26, no. 50, p. 103-12.
20. Nowakowski P.T. (2010), The academic as knowledge purveyor: deontological considerations, "International Journal of Arts & Sciences", no. 3 (8), p. 487-95.
21. Rewera M. (2011), List do redakcji, "Studia Socjologiczne", no. 4 (203), p. 209-12.
22. Szadkowski K. (2015), Uniwersytet jako dobro wspólne. Podstawy krytycznych badań nad szkolnictwem wyższym, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
23. (wap) (2008), Profesor obraził profesora. Finał konfliktu pomiędzy naukowcami UMK, "Nowości: gazeta Pomorza i Kujaw", no. 37, p. 3.
24. Wieczorek J. (2009), Mediator akademicki jako przeciwdziałanie mobbingowi w środowisku akademickim, Niezależne Forum Akademickie, Kraków.

УДК 37.091.33

Новікова К.А.

**Харківський національний медичний університет
ВИКОРИСТАННЯ ІНТЕРАКТИВНИХ ВЕБ-ТЕХНОЛОГІЙ У
НАВЧАЛЬНОМУ ПРОЦЕСІ ДИСЦИПЛІНИ
«ГІСТОЛОГІЯ, ЦИТОЛОГІЯ ТА ЕМБРІОЛОГІЯ»**

Вивчення гістології, цитології та ембріології є неймовірно важливим для студентів-медиків, адже отримані знання, разом з іншими базовими дисциплінами, стануть фундаментом клінічного мислення майбутніх лікарів. Тому необхідно постійно вдосконалювати методи навчання для досягнення максимально ефективного розуміння предмету студентами-медиками. У наш час викладачу доступні різноманітні методики інтерактивного навчання з використанням веб-