

TEACHING CRITICAL THINKING IN HISTORY CLASS

Шонь О.Б.

*кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри англійської філології та методики навчання англійської мови
Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет
імені Володимира Гнатюка
м. Тернопіль, Україна*

In the world of practically unlimited access to information the ability of students to select relevant information is widely discussed. As R.M. Schmaltz, E. Jansen and N. Wenckowski state, students have access to nearly limitless information, and the skills to understand what misinformation is or a questionable scientific claim is crucially important [1]. At the same time, according to I. Wright, students need a great deal of information before they can think critically; as the knowledge "explosion" continues, it is assumed that students need increasing amounts of information [3].

More information is needed to ensure objectivity. Considering this, educators once again shift focus from obtaining information to ability to analyse it, identify credible sources, evaluate information and be able to respond to arguments, consider and evaluate alternative viewpoints, be able to define the difference between facts and opinions. The need for teaching critical thinking at schools and universities is recognized.

M. Scriven and R. Paul define critical thinking as the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action [2].

However, R.M. Schmaltz, E. Jansen and N. Wenckowski propose that in addition to teaching critical thinking educators should place a strong focus on teaching students how to think like scientists. Scientific thinking is the ability to generate, test, and evaluate claims, data, and theories. They state that the basic tenets of scientific thinking provide students with the tools to distinguish good information from bad and argue that by promoting scientific thinking, educators can ensure that students are at least exposed to the basic tenets of what makes a good argument, how to create their own arguments, recognize their own biases and those of others, and how to think like a scientist [1].

Teaching the course "History of Great Britain" to the first-year students of the Foreign Languages Department (Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University) the author incorporated methods of teaching critical thinking so that the students are able not only to perceive the information or learn basic facts. It is equally important to develop their ability to consider different points of view and to distinguish between facts and opinions. Various activities are suggested in class to develop students' ability to think critically. The following are the tasks samples.

1. Invade or Not to Invade? When the students learn about the Roman invasion they get the task to discuss various reasons for and against invasion as seen from the Roman

V МІЖНАРОДНА НАУКОВО-ПРАКТИЧНА КОНФЕРЕНЦІЯ

perspective, explain why every reason was important, group them and make the conclusion the reasons in which group were the most numerous and decisive:

- *Britain has lots of cattle for meat and leather.* (Reason to invade)
- *Britain has some gold, iron and wood.* (Reason to invade)
- *The Britons are helping the people of Gaul who are enemies of Rome.* (Reason to invade)
- *The people in Britain are fighting each other.* (Reason to invade)
- *The Britons are good fighters.* (Reason not to invade)

2. Roman or Celt? When the students learn about the Boudicca's rebellion against the Romans their task is to discuss the quotes about the Celtic queen taken from various sources. They have to define which point of view the quote reflects, Roman or Celtic, and explain the evidence found in every source:

- *"The Celt armies wrecked and robbed two cities, many innocent people were killed".*
- *"Boudicca was a treacherous lioness".*
- *"The fury of a Celtic people, led by an enraged queen, was a force to be reckoned with".*

3. Fact vs Opinion. When the students learn about the Scandinavian invasion they get the task to define each statement as fact or opinion and explain the answer (before that students brainstorm how facts and opinions differ and what marks them as such:

- *The Vikings came from Norway, Sweden and Denmark.* (Fact)
- *The Vikings were not very good at farming.* (Opinion)
- *The Vikings travelled as far as North America.* (Fact)
- *They loved attacking and raiding other countries.* (Opinion)
- *Lindisfarne is in the north of England.* (Fact)

4. Who is a proper king? Discussing the situation in England prior to the Norman invasion the students' task is to consider the three main candidates to get the crown and classify the following criteria into three groups: essential, desirable and undesirable: *Good at poetry, good at handling taxes, a strong fighter, diplomatic, lazy, good-looking, good at music, mature, popular with people, live in England, have a legitimate claim, just and fair, son of the king, greedy, elected by the Witan, merry.*

Analysis of feedback shows that such tasks are effective in teaching critical thinking in history class. At the same time students consider them demanding as they deal not only with facts but with various approaches and opinions. However, these tasks boost students' discussion, enliven the class and provide emotional colouring that help to remember the historical data.

REFERENCES

1. Schmaltz R.M., Jansen E., Wenckowski N. Redefining Critical Thinking: Teaching Students to Think like Scientists. *Frontiers in Psychology*, March 2017. Volume 8. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00459

2. Scriven M., Paul R. Defining Critical Thinking. 8th Annual International Conference on Critical Thinking and Education Reform, 1987. Available at: <http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/defining-critical-thinking/76>

3. Wright I. Critical thinking in the schools: why doesn't much happen? *Informal Logic*, 2001. DOI: 10.22329/il.v22i2.2579

MESURING FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS' EMOTION LABOR

Дацків О.П.

*кандидат педагогічних наук,
доцент кафедри англійської філології та методики навчання англійської мови
Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет
імені Володимира Гнатюка
м. Тернопіль, Україна*

Since the beginning of the 21st century, there has been a significant increase in research into the emotions of foreign language learners. By advancing knowledge in this area, it is possible to improve not only the job satisfaction and emotional well-being of teachers but also the learning outcomes for students, as the mental state of the teacher can have a significant impact on the quality of their teaching and the emotions of their students.

The term 'emotional labor' was first introduced by sociologist A. Hochschild in 1983. It refers to the practice of managing emotions in the workplace in a way that meets the expectations of others. This involves either suppressing or inducing certain feelings in order to maintain the appropriate emotional state for the situation. A. Hochschild identified two ways in which people manage their emotions when they differ from the expected emotional norms: surface acting, which involves altering one's outward appearance, and deep acting, which involves inducing a genuine feeling. G. Näring, M. Briët, and A. Brouwers have added the third type of emotional labor, the suppression of emotion, to Hochschild's original taxonomy [4].

S. Benesch has revised the concept of emotional labor by retaining some of Hochschild's original ideas while also modifying others. While both A. Hochschild and S. Benesch acknowledge the connection between emotional labor and power imbalances, S. Benesch introduces the idea that unequal power can be resisted.

Qualitative studies involving semi-structured interviews established that teachers perform emotion labor primarily to increase student engagement, demonstrate care for their students, and maintain positive relationships with them. The demands of this emotional labor result in emotional exhaustion and reduced self-efficacy, potentially leading to burnout. Thus, emotional labor demands can lead to negative outcomes for teachers.

S. Benesch investigated language teachers' emotion labor in three areas: dealing with late or absent students, interacting with learners about plagiarism, and responding to student writing. The study found that emotion labor was a common experience for teachers in these situations, suggesting that managing emotions is an essential aspect of language teaching [2]. The primary focus of emotion labor is the overwhelming responsibility placed on teachers to guarantee successful language outcomes for their students, regardless of the