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***Abstract.*** The article is devoted to highlighting the structural elements of modern research models of learning, which are used in the teaching of humanitarian educational components at the Donetsk National Medical University. It was found that the use of these learning models increases and improves the efficiency of the educational process, which largely depends on the desire of teachers to implement these learning models and the desire of students to master them.
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The global nature of the changes taking place at the end of the 20th century and in the first quarter of the 21st century determines, as a priority, the task of integrating the education system of Ukraine into the European educational space. The Ukrainian educational system must adapt to the European system and at the same time make its own significant contribution to its enrichment. The entry of the national education system into the Bologna process increased competition between higher education institutions, which necessitates the need to increase the level of competitiveness of educational services, update the content of education, introduce educational innovations and information technologies. Increasing the level of competitiveness of university graduates involves the development of complex measures to ensure the universalization of their training based on the application of flexible training models.

For consideration, I would like to propose learning models as research, which are used in the teaching of humanitarian educational components at the Donetsk National Medical University. Among them: research models of Gholson, Zuchman, Beyer, Nelson, Joyce, Massialas and Michaelis, Fenton, Hoover, Goldmark.

The simplest research models are those consisting of three steps – Gholson and Zuchman. Goulson's research model, also known as the «three question model», applies to current events: «What happened? Why did this happen? What are the possible consequences?». Regarding historical events that have already taken place, the last third question has the following form: «What were the consequences of what happened?». Zuchman's research model consists of three sections: 1) planning of research activities (definition of goals; preparation of problems; preparation of visual aids for presenting the problem); 2) performing research activities (showing, presenting the problem; building hypotheses and collecting data; summarizing); 3) assessment of research activity (assessment of process and content) [4, р. 119].

Beyer's research model is reduced to five sections and has the following form: 1) definition of the problem (awareness of the existence of the problem; awareness of its importance; giving the problem such an appearance when it can be solved); 2) working out possible options for solving the problem (studying and classifying available data; finding relationships and drawing logical conclusions; proposing hypotheses); 3) verification of hypotheses, predictions (data collection; data organization; data analysis); 4) drawing up a final conclusion; 5) application of the conclusion [2, р. 64]. Nelson's research model also involves five consecutive actions: 1) defining and formulating the essence of the problem; 2) proposing a hypothesis; 3) data collection and evaluation; 4) hypothesis testing, predicted conclusion and 5) decision making. Similar to it is Joyce's research model, which also proposes five sequential actions, but in two phases. The first phase is encountering the problem and determining the attitude towards it; research organization; operations; reflection and assessment; conclusions The second phase, which is a repeated cycle, repeats the last four steps [1, р. 73].

The research models of Massialas and Michaelis consist of six sequential actions. Thus, the research model of Massialas involves: 1) orientation; 2) development of hypotheses; 3) definition of the terms included in the hypothesis; 4) analysis of hypotheses from the point of view of their logical consistency and internal consistency; 5) confirmation of hypotheses or collection of facts and confirmations; 6) formulation of generalizations. Mikaelis' research model includes: 1) problem definition; 2) proposing a hypothesis or problems directing further study; 3) selection of information sources; 4) analysis and synthesis of data from found sources; 5) organization of data to answer the questions and test the hypothesis; 6) interpretation of data relative to social, economic and political processes [3, р. 25].

Several research models consist of seven algorithmic actions – Fenton, Hoover, Goldmark. Thus, Fenton's research model contains seven consecutive steps: 1) vision of the problem based on existing data; 2) formulation of hypotheses; 3) understanding the logical consequences of hypotheses; 4) data collection for the purpose of testing hypotheses; 5) analysis, assessment and interpretation of data; 6) evaluation of hypotheses regarding the collected data; 7) formulation of generalizations or conclusions. Hoover's research model, which also consists of seven algorithmic actions, involves: 1) awareness and formulation of the problem; 2) clarification of disputed issues; 3) planning and development of educational activities; 4) data collection; 5) notification of procedures; 6) offering generalizations; 7) evaluation of the conducted research. Goldmark's research model includes: 1) recognition of the need for research; 2) formulation of the hypothesis; 3) data collection; 4) analysis of alternative hypotheses; 5) definition of criteria; 6) determination of value orientations and initial predictions; 7) study of the research process [4, р. 121].

Let us dwell in more detail on the description and analysis of the model of scientific research in the humanities, with the help of which the research process itself becomes the main content of education. The basis of the model is the orientation to scientific research as a model for building learning, the understanding that the ideas of science can be fully assimilated only in the context of their origin, which determines further research; accordingly, in the course of training, the humanitarian educational component is research.

Oral and written presentation of the material within the scope of the research approach emphasizes the relativity of existing knowledge; the presentation includes the history of scientific discoveries. Research tasks are problems for which there are no answers in the text of the textbook. The educational process is permeated by «invitations to discoveries». Each of these «invitations» directly introduces the acquirers to the process of searching for knowledge, involves them in this process. The teacher's task is not to illustrate the logic of the experiment, but to give students the opportunity to make different predictions. If the predictions do not arise, the teacher can propose them himself as possible ways of reasoning. And in general, the teacher should have a general attitude to encourage students to make any predictions.

The starting point of this technique is a paradoxical situation that generates a cognitive conflict. For example, the teacher shows a fragment of a documentary film from a specific historical period, and the students' involuntary interest in the paradox gives the first impetus to the emergence of research interest. After the demonstration, applicants can ask the teacher questions. But, according to the rules, it is «forbidden» to ask questions that require the teacher to explain the essence of the phenomena. «Allowed» questions that can be answered with «yes» or «no». Thus, each question contains a certain hypothesis. For example, the teacher will not answer the question: «How did the industrial revolution affect the formation of an industrial society?», because such an answer would mean informing the learner of a ready-made cognitive reference point. It is another matter if the acquirer asks: «Is the transition to a new stage of civilization development necessarily accompanied by a revolution in production (agrarian, industrial, scientific and technical)?». A question of this type assumes that the applicant independently finds patterns in the development of civilizations based on the data provided by the teacher, tries to independently test the proposed hypothesis.

From awareness of a problem as a result of a cognitive conflict, acquirers move to collecting and analyzing data, proposing and testing hypotheses. Instrumentally, this is embodied in the observation of demonstration experiments, setting up an imaginary experiment. The main means of obtaining missing data is to ask the teacher questions. The teacher does not comment on the hypotheses of the applicants, refrains from approving or disapproving the content of the expressed ideas, but welcomes each idea as a starting point for further research. The teacher responds to the specific predictions of the applicants in the following way: «Well, you have come up with something like an original theory. Try to check it. You can test it experimentally». At the same time, the «experiment» is usually imaginary, it is replaced by questions to the teacher.

An encouraging, supportive attitude towards the cognitive activity of the acquirers is combined with a neutral attitude towards the «results» of search thinking – the very process of cognitive search is important.

Therefore, research skills, research experience as a method and the essence of scientific knowledge are formed in research models of education, learning contributes not only to the assimilation of knowledge as generalizations accepted at the moment, but also to mastering the very process in which these generalizations are created and verified.
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