

ОСВІТА У ФІЛОСОФСЬКО-АНТРОПОЛОГІЧНИХ РЕФЛЕКСІЯХ

УДК 378.013.43:316.72

COMMUNICATIVE ASPECTS OF INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

Iryna Barantsova, Viktoriya Kotlyarova, Maryna Tkach

Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky State Pedagogical University

Resume:

Intercultural education is a very important part of general and higher education today. It is mainly based on the communicative aspects, which are closely connected with a dialogue.

The article deals with the intercultural dialogue. It is the basis of the theoretical and methodological support of the spiritual development of a man.

Definition of the earlier nature of the dialogue, from a philosophical point of view, as an element of the theoretical, methodological, spiritual and ethical principles, in particular as a fundamental principle that is subjectively a fundamental requirement and a prerequisite for the thinking and behavior of the individual (maxim), and objectively leading the spiritual and practical norm of human co-existence, makes it possible to conclude that such a methodological guideline is not leading in existing cultural and educational practices that remain beyond the scope of dialogue, without the use of dialogue in the cultural and educational process.

Key words:

intercultural education; dialogue; communication; communicative aspect; human development.

Анотація:

Баранцова Ірина, Котлярова Вікторія, Ткач Марина. Комунікативні аспекти міжкультурної освіти.

Міжкультурна освіта нині є важливою частиною загальної та вищої освіти. Здебільшого вона базується на комунікативних аспектах, які тісно пов'язані з діалогом, зокрема міжкультурним, про який ідеться в статті. Діалог – це основа теоретико-методологічного забезпечення духовного розвитку людини. Визначення більш раннього характеру діалогу, з погляду філософії, як елемента теоретичних, методологічних, духовно-етичних принципів, зокрема як фундаментального принципу, який є суб'єктивно фундаментальною вимогою та передумовою мислення й поведінки особистості (максима) і який об'єктивно керує духовною та практичною нормою людського співіснування, дає змогу дійти висновку, що таке методологічне керівництво не є провідним у наявних культурних та освітніх практиках. Такі практики залишаються поза рамками діалогу, і він не використовується в культурно-освітньому процесі.

Ключові слова:

міжкультурна освіта; діалог; спілкування; комунікативний аспект; людський розвиток.

Аннотация:

Баранцова Ирина, Котлярова Виктория, Ткач Марина. Коммуникативные аспекты межкультурного образования.

Межкультурное образование является сегодня очень важной частью общего и высшего образования. В основном оно базируется на коммуникативных аспектах, тесно связанных с диалогом, в частности межкультурным, о котором идет речь в статье. Диалог – это основа теоретического и методического обеспечения духовного развития человека. Определение более ранней природы диалога, с философской точки зрения, как элемента теоретических, методологических, духовных и этических принципов, в частности, как фундаментального принципа, который субъективно является фундаментальным требованием и предпосылкой для мышления и поведения личности (максима) и который объективно руководит духовной и практической нормой человеческого сосуществования, позволяет сделать вывод, что такое методологическое руководство не ведет к существующим культурным и образовательным практикам. Такие практики остаются за рамками диалога, и он не используется в культурно-образовательном процессе.

Ключевые слова:

межкультурное образование; диалог; связь; коммуникативный аспект; человеческое развитие.

Setting of the problem. Extremely important theoretical foundations for overcoming the contradictions in this process are studies in which the methodological ideas of dialogue as a way of being and dialogical understanding are substantiated (M. Bakhtin, V. Bibler, H. G. Gadamer etc.), which explore the problem of understanding in detail. The problem of dialogical understanding as a way of being, which leads to the spiritual growth of a man and the question of dialogical ontology, is disclosed in the writings of M. Buber, F. Rosenzweig, et al.

In this way, its essential characteristics are not disclosed, and, therefore, the possibilities of influence on the cultural and educational situation to a large extent do not unfold. Moreover, if one or another of the dialogue remains beyond the actual problems of modernizing modern education and the

“knowledge society”, the general feature of which, according to S. Proletov, is “... a profound transformation of knowledge into various information constellations and the primacy of flexibility and speed of operation from information on conventional intellectual procedures and practices [19, с. 7-24], then it cannot be considered a complete process of human spiritual development. Since the philosophers' postulate about the cultivation of a cultural person remains unchanged, the theoretical justification of the anthropological movement of a man from knowledge (in its broad substantive content as meaning) to the intellectual-ethical and spiritual interaction of the subjects of the world is needed.

The objective of the article is to reveal the main characteristics of the intercultural dialogue and to

analyze the methodological orientees of communicative aspects in cultural and educational space.

On the basis of the analysis of only encyclopedic editions most commonly used by the representatives of humanities, it was possible to highlight some significant moments of both the essential and existential content of the dialogue. Almost all dictionaries, indicating the Greek origin of the concept of “dialogue”, literally reveal it as a conversation, presentation of the problem, the exchange of replicas, etc.; in this sense there is a need to speak about terminological interpretations, which this concept acquires in specific scientific theses: as a separate genre of literature, including philosophical one; as the disclosure of a topic in a conversation of two or more persons; as one of the forms of art to conduct a conversation (V. Kokhanovsky); as a form of progressive development of the cognitive process, when the movement to the desired result is carried out through interaction, different points of view (E. Rapatsevich); as a form of communication between people, when the meaning varies depending on the purpose of communication (M. Bulatov), etc.; it is this reduction that identifies the dialogue with almost all conversations.

Since that time, terminology and conceptual dialogue has changed, according to many scholars (M. Bulatov, V. Tancher, V. Andrushchenko, etc.), was enriched by L. Feuerbach, M. Buber, M. Bakhtin, K. Apel, J. Habermas (according to the latter within the framework of communicative ethics, the dialogue was understood as a discourse of a theoretical and analytical procedure, as a method of scientific analysis of a complex of problems with the accentuation of prudent, logical, conceptual elements and analysis tools, provided that they are supplemented by different approaches, interpretive insight, value correlation, rhetorical power, etc.).

However, as noted above, its original goals are: the content of dialogue as a form of dialectics, a means for defining concepts as a method of finding truth, which often remains beyond the comprehension of phenomena and is replaced by the analysis of many existential, practical actuals, etc. Therefore, remembering Socrates, who considered the dialectic to be worthy of the only human problem, its morals and, unlike the Sophists, who first laid the basis for the dialogue as a logical operation and a way of philosophizing and even the “middle” art of the birth of truth in human consciousness (Mayevics), his positions should be considered imperative.

It should be noted that in present conditions of the communication of different cultures, each of which is unique, without a “dialectical dialogue”, as the prevention of the destruction of cultures in general, the absorption of certain cultures more technologically developed and, moreover, the

promotion of the preservation of cultures and the enhancement of cultural heritage and the creation of a “cultural circle” is not possible. This has particular significance with regard to the dialogue that addresses spiritual values, which, in our opinion, has not yet been fully involved in a large-scale social dialogue and in cultural and educational process.

It is for this purpose that in the educational and cultural environment where there is a collision of various scientific, philosophical and religious discourses and where a certain continuum is born, such as the unity of institutions of education, science and culture, as the unification of the interests of various cultural identities, as the unification of personal, group and universal human positions, we should implement the idea of polydiscursivity. It suggests that perception of one or another phenomenon is possible only in the intersection of various communicative practices, and when the phenomenon of inter-religious, intercultural dialogue forms the basis for establishing multicultural stability, tolerant socialization of the individual, and the dialogue becomes in fact a polylogue and a way of finding, in our opinion, interculturalism.

In this sense, the fundamental question is the use of various discourses that have a certain social significance and specificity in dialogue, since “discourse” in scientific literature is defined as “linguistic activity regulated by socio-cultural codes (rules, traditions and values) of a particular social practice (science, justice, medicine, religion, politics, education, etc.), through which people - within the limits of this practice - produce, use and broadcast socio-cultural meanings, models of social experience, realize their own objective and / or communication needs” [16, c.37].

The study of the works on intercultural dialogue, referred to above, made it possible the provision that scientific discourse is focused on the rational organization of communication and its social effectiveness, on the disclosure of ideological contradictions, based on the following principles:

- the principle of cognition, according to which the modality of discourse is realized in the space of subject-object relations and evaluated in terms of the classical concept of truth (“true” or “false”), which differs from the communicative modality of the pragmatic theory of truth (“effective” or “ineffective”);
- the principle of reflexivity and objectivity of discussion, which manifests itself in the rational conceptual nature of the process and the result of communication, in the transition from ordinary consciousness to rational one during the dialogue;
- the principle of systematic and organized dialogue, which organically combines all levels of human consciousness (public, personal);

- the principle of a high logical culture of dialogue, which involves knowledge of the laws of formal logic and rules of reasoning, the opposition to manipulative techniques in communication, as well as the criterion of seriousness, the inadmissibility of irony in relation to the sphere of sacred view;

- the principle of objective unity and functional complementarity of the positions of the parties in the dialogue, based on the idea that all social institutions in society (religion inclusive) form the functional integrity of society, mutually reinforcing each other, solve common problems and have a common goal - a stable civil democratic society with high morality;

- the principle of scientific and historical ways in the conduct of dialogue, the inadmissibility of non-scientific, non-historical arguments in the dialogue of religions, taken from questionable sources both to the religious audience and to the scientific community;

- the principle of deideologization, when the model of dialogue is based on deideological practice, on non-political engagement and on the avoidance of manipulative schemes and techniques by different ideologues of politicized consciousness (the concept of state religion, world domination of religion);

- the principle of demythologization, the overcoming of value-emotional representations (mythologeme), and the stereotypedness, which are manifested at the level of social psychology, mass consciousness, for example the existing belief that in Islam the spirit of aggression and evil prevails, that the woman is enslaved there, that Christianity is degenerated, there is polytheism and paganism, etc.);

- the principle of emotional and psychological support of the parties in the dialogue, support of psychological comfort and empathy.

In a somewhat different aspect, these authors traditionally present the tradition of philosophical discourse in a dialogue that dates back to antiquity - from the mayevtics of Socrates, and is now represented by the works of F. Rosenzweig, O. Rosenschtock Hussy, F. Ebner, M. Buber, M. Bakhtin et al. In contrast to the scientific and religious discourse involved in the dialogue, philosophical discourse is fundamentally polyphonic, pluralistic, subjected to various epistemological, methodological, and value-setting approaches that fundamentally differ, but keep "definitive correctness and logical coherence" [16, c.37].

With such a characteristic of discourse you can agree, but under certain conditions: firstly, one cannot refuse any discourse in dialogue, since the goal of dialogue is understanding, and discourse is not a formal phenomenon: it represents a particular type of worldview, that is, attitude towards the world; consequently, if different positions are not articulated in the interaction, to find an understanding and consensus in the dialogue; and secondly, discourse is the result of the knowledge of the world of each type

of worldview, therefore, the picture of the world becomes much more complete due to the polydiscursiveness; thirdly, you can not simultaneously and quickly teach different people the best ways to understand the world.

That is why the problem of discourse should be translated into a plane of cultural and educational space in which the educational discourse prevails, the essence of which is not defined by E. Dobrenkov as a formalized system of transfer of knowledge, but as a problem field for the development of subjects of the discourse of educational and scientific knowledge, which testifies about their temporary status as agents of cognitive dialogue or the information process of knowledge exchange [8, c.14].

The content of educational discourse is manifested in the search and implementation of cognitive and communicative means that represent the professional, cultural, social ideals of education and construct professional, socio-cultural, personal identities. The analysis of numerous literatures makes it possible to name the following principles of such discourse:

- the principle of creative learning (if the purpose of scientific discourse consists in the production and systematization of objectively true knowledge about the world, their practical use, and also in the invention of research methods, the purpose of educational discourse is to transform and translate the received scientific knowledge to the younger generation in creative formation interest in its inclusion in intellectual and social activities, in orientation not only on the completeness of the translated knowledge, but also on its accessibility to the addressees);

- the principle of socialization, the inclusion of the individual in an integral system of social relations, including through the mastery of various kinds of discursive practices in order to create a more general discourse field in which targeted socialization and inculturation of individuals are carried out;

- the principle of personal development, based on the postulate of incompleteness of the ideal project, which is a person in the present and in the future, one of the potential of which is an open attitude to the world and creative dialogue interaction with the world;

- the principle of the unity of the educational space. Proceeding from the multicultural environment of the corresponding space, all its parts, secular and religious education systems form a unified integrity in the relationship of trends: the integration of parts of the system through the universalization of scientific knowledge and the differentiation of parts of the system through regional traditions and ethnoconfessional identity;

- the principle of educational competence, which contains a set of pupils' competences in the sphere of

cognitive activity within the framework of socio-cultural dialogue with elements of logical, methodological, general education and social activity, as well as system integrity with value-oriented, general, cultural, informational, communicative, social and religious competences;

- the principle of socialization as an active, effective desire to find a common sense plane that will become the place of voluntary involvement of the participants in the dialogue as higher religious values and participation in a single event;

- the principle of polydiscursiveness, which involves mastering hermeneutics as a reading of various linguistic practices (scientific, philosophical, literary, religious, etc.) for an adequate understanding of the sociocultural traditions of society. Thus, educational discourse is important in the field of dialogue, since it adapts other types of discourses to the consciousness of its participants, including them in creative self-expression and reflection of the themes of the dialogue.

This is the way in which the principle of recognition of the monotheistic nature of the religion can proceed. First of all, it should be noted that a complete education can not be built, leaving out the constitutive factors of influence on the spirituality of a man, because the changes taking place now in the world environment are increasingly “compressing” the cultural space by expansion of interconnection, interdependence of different countries, peoples, cultures (national, ethnic, gender, political, economic, religious, etc.). At the cultural level, humanity can not be interested in finding an agreement, consent in resolving controversial issues, preventing the escalation of violence in resolving controversial issues, which may lead to conflicts and other threatening phenomena.

Moreover, if one understands the discourse (from the Latin *discere* to wander) as “an orally or in writing an articulated form of objectification of the content of consciousness, which is determined by the type of rationality dominant in a certain sociocultural tradition” [17, c.148].

In this context, intercultural discourse in any dialogue has the advantage, since it represents a higher degree of reflection, comprehension of the essence of the subject of dialogue, based on philosophical categories and universals. The categories as “the most general concepts of a particular field of knowledge and science serve to reduce the experience of finding objective relations, dismemberment and synthesis of reality ... and universals, which belong to a being” allow you to liberate the essence of the phenomena around which the dialogue is unfolding, from denotations and connotations of other discourses [5, c.522].

This situation is a common thing in the relationship microcosm of a man, the main

component of which is taking estimates, arguments, conclusions without proofs when the arguments are tested vital world, traditions, public opinion, the charisma of personality, etc., emotional contact that can both increase the effect of credibility, and offend the “voice” of rational arguments.

You should bear in mind that active, emotional and rational relationship between a man and spiritual phenomena, especially in the modern world, which, as ever, shows many contradictions, uncertainties and impossibilities of complete rational assimilation of the world is always about horizons of metaphysics and metaphysical thinking forms, in particular, “the communicative mind in the diversity of its votes” [9].

At the same time, the dialogic form of communication within a communicative everyday practice without the use of heuristic methods of teaching and the study of intercultural relations shifts the emphasis from the person to the objective world, from the intelligible world to sensory-emotional one, etc. Consequently, translating the dialogue into a cultural and educational space is necessary.

These issues have been updated and widespread in some areas of modernization, humanization and democratization of education. However, in today's transition from the “educational” paradigm of education and upbringing to a culturally oriented human development that includes all the various discourses as influential factors in human development, the formation of a person who is spiritually enriched, capable of understanding the meaning of one's own and another's culture, should be recognized as expedient and absolutely necessary strategy of dialogue interaction.

Understanding, as a procedure for comprehension or creation of meaning, categorical status was given by F. Schleiermacher, who interpreted it as a procedure for identifying the meaning of the text in the process of its interpretation and reconstruction of the original plan. Based on this idea, V. Abushenko adds that understanding is a way of explication of the question which was asked before and was laid in text. The main classical concept of understanding, in our opinion, was formulated by W. Windelband, H. Rickert and other philosophers whose ideas were then reflected in social knowledge of M. Weber, V. Dilthey and found their “existential” continuation in “postmetaphysical thinking” of Yu. Habermas and in the concept of dialogue of M. Bakhtin.

Due to the theories of many famous scientists the dialogic strategy, in our opinion, passed from an extremely important plane, which is social communication, to cultural, educational and spiritual space that enriched not only complex and contradictory process of knowing the world, but also filled the multifaceted human life with dialogues and dialogue situations.

At the same time the possibility and potential of dialogue as a way of realizing individual subjectivity in cognition and activities, as well as algorithms of human movement from ignorance to understanding and comprehension of the metaphysical reality is not sufficiently grounded in science, although many thoughts and attitudes of today, which are based on dialogic universals of being and which should be assimilated by a person, in one form or another have already been considered in the past. In this sense, an important appeal to the philosophy that has presented the apodictic meaning of the phenomenon of “understanding” appears.

Consequently, the criterion of the depth of understanding is one of the higher criteria for learning dialogical interaction and the organization of dialogue in practice. It is known that any practice has a historical character, a variety of forms, it is open to the outside world and it can not be identified with either the absolute thing or the substance. In addition, the practical relations take place in the same interaction planes (in essence): in the object-object plane (the transformation of the world under the influence of a man) and in the subject-subject plane (communication of people in the process of these transformations). In particular, regardless of the types of activity, economic, religious or other, the person as its subject, constantly implements the process of inextricable, continuous reproduction of unity with the object, even if their views do not coincide. Moreover, they coincide with the components of activity that can be structured according to procedural characteristics as follows:

- value-motivational, that is, the component, which causes, initiates and directs the action (and, as V. Abuzhenko notes, “... not knowledge creates a need for something, but, on the contrary, the need leads to cognition, because the subject needs understanding ...” [1, c. 767];
- informational and regulatory, which contains many different ideal programs and models of action;
- operational, in which motives turn into the physical actions of the subject;
- effective, in which the actions of the subject are objectified, acquire a certain form of existence;
- thereafter there is a reflexive evaluation, on which goals and results are compared, there is a new situation that causes a new cycle of activity, in particular, there is an apperceptive and expetial dialogue, which becomes very common in the modern public space - the space of social interaction, which is the market of the city that is open to all, regardless of sex, race, religion, ethnic origin, age or socioeconomic status, space that does not have entrance tickets, where the incoming person is not discriminated on the ground of origin, etc.

Polish professor E. Matinya writes that “... in society sometimes there is a protest, as well as a

struggle with imposed forms of behavior ... these protests can be compared with the carnival, along with the temporarily sanctioned disagreements embedded therein. But, she says, “... this volatile sphere of community and dialogue plays a significant role in the emergence of a network of civic attitudes and the revival of the embryonic public sphere”, and suggests several thoughts that can be transposed into social and religious practice: they should be viewed locally to the ground under their feet, to the places that each of us knows best, to places and narratives that have helped each of us overcome political and cultural separatism, reduce tension ...; one should learn the readiness to detolate the truth in the ecumenical approach; hospitality and generosity should be a key element of practice ... regardless of context; epistemologically it is necessary to pay attention to “knowledge with an accent”, which can become for us the source of new plans and decisions of the problems of divided communities and societies; to bring to life the hospitality and openness that spread the dialogue in all its diversity, to embody them in the model of “civil architecture” - the agora as a place of “appearance” of a dialogue, a place where there are those who otherwise would never meet ..., but they (people) stayed here voluntarily” [6, c. 559-567].

Thus, for the sake of the supremacy of a higher level of human interaction - understanding - and in order to prevent the era of silence, dialogue is precisely the “frontier”, where there is a combination of fragmented parts of the consciousness of different cultures and identities, and where, on the basis of mutual understanding, the walls of identity are overcome, the competences of their interweaving, the ethos of the border is popularized, and cities are presented between people of different cultures, religions and ethnic groups (colloquiums of dialogue, mobile academies of dialogue, “round tables”, “word-café”, religious festivals, etc.

This scientific search must be, of course, problem-oriented and object-oriented both in the past and in modern times. In addition, it should first of all be aimed at substantiation of dialogical strategies, which, by purpose, through the purpose and mechanisms of the implementation of the idea of dialogue, carry out a theoretical transition to operational action, from the theory to practice. Moreover, it is necessary to do this in the cultural and educational space, in which cultural and educational practices among them should unfold the mode of the traditional institution of socialization of personality and the translation of experience in the mode of cultural and educational designing of equal interaction, in which communication and dialogue appear not only regulators of relations of objects, but also ways of persuading a person in the necessity of co-operation with other people, assimilation of basic

moral and ethical truths, filling of individual existence with the meaning of comprehension with a bundle of their individual being with a certain spiritual integrity.

In this process, even if we mean the above-mentioned growth of the public dialogue, the lack of cultural and educational management, capable of bringing a person's life out of everyday life, remains to a large extent. The arsenal of management and strategies and technologies of education, science, culture, religion used in the past day can not be met today by a person who seeks for free self-development, respect and cooperation. The problem of communicative strategies in one way or another is presented in the works of K.O.-Apel, E. Bern, V. Bibler, M. Bakhtin, I. Kagan, V. Lorenz, V. Malakhov, A. Yermolenko, J. Habermas, K. Jaspers and other philosophers. The thorough disclosure of the functions of communication and dialogue as regulators of relations of the subjects of society, the definition of the principles of socio-philosophical analysis and the methodology of the study of the components of communication and dialogue have greatly enriched as the science and practice of strategic management of social and cultural-educational processes, as well as the technology of directing human self-movement to intelligence, morality and spirituality.

However, applied developments, in which scientists offered the mechanisms and algorithms of management or implementation of communication and dialogue precisely in our time and in a concrete context, are not sufficient. It is worth mentioning the work of the authors who explicitly and substantively explored the essence of communication and dialogue as ways of consolidating communities of different levels in concrete forms, in particular in the socio-cultural space and in different management situations. These are the works of such scholars as H. Ball, V. Beh, J. Habermas, G. Schedrovitsky, A. Shyuts, A. Yermolenko, K. Jaspers and others.

At the same time, the common practice of cultural-educational direction, which attracts more and more people, nevertheless, often remain outside of these developments and continue to take into account only everyday experience and the "world of life". This state of affairs makes it possible to "slip" the search for constructivism towards profanation, to simplify the situation. Hence, these practices and actions deprive the interaction of intellectual and value-semantic content.

The analysis of the ways of communication and dialogue in the form of communicative and dialogic strategies, which are important ways of constructing self-development of the individual and various forms of social relations, shows the need to consider any activity, including religious, through the prism of the components of activity as such, its functions, and the

conceptual dimension of the actions of the person himself.

Not going deep into the philosophical and psychological concepts of activity as a form of an active attitude of a man to the world in order to transform it, it should be noted that activity, the main characteristic of which is consciousness, morphologically consists of the subject of activity, motives, tasks, actions, operations, etc., where social actions appear to be the simplest units of activity. However, the emphasis on the morphological aspect of the activity, as evidenced by experience and practice analysis, tends to lead to fragmentary activity, when its true characteristics (purposefulness, objectivity, universality, creative and general significance, etc.), as well as its internal mechanisms remain outside the analytical and operational action. In this way, understanding does not allow identifying the activities and actions that are defined by psychologists as "the purposeful transfer of motion and information from one participant to another ... (direct - contact, mediate - distant)" [26, c.69].

Consequently, unlike the structure of activity that we have previously disclosed and which should be the basis for constructing dialogical strategies, functional separation elements should also be taken into account:

- the element that causes the action, which includes the needs and interests of subjects who initiate and direct the action;
- informational and regulatory, created by a variety of different ideal programs and models of action;
- operational, in which inductive motives turn into physical actions of the subject and are carried out with loss of energy;
- productive, in which the actions of the subject are objectified, acquiring forms of existence, different from the subject.

In this state, the result of action, as noted by V. Krzhevov, V. Kuznetsov, O. Oganov, A. Panarin, A. Razin and other philosophers, correlates with the needs and interests, as well as with the goals and motives of the subject, and therefore the result can be regarded as a new component of the objective situation, in which the subject and characteristics of which he should take into account in the new cycles of activity [18, c.520].

Modern cultural and educational space is characterized by constant expansion, acceleration, strengthening of communication ties and their internationalization. They engage more and more people in different cultures, confessions, communication technologies that enable informal communication, that is, dialogue out of control by social institutions and free personal representations, etc., in communication and dialogue. Outside public

institutions that act as forms of regulation of social relations, the content of which is a dialogue, new structures “work” on the feeling of belonging to one or another community.

Taking the unequivocal assertion that communication is reflected in strategies and technologies realization of which is associated with significant goals and objectives, it should be noted that in the forms of socio-cultural choices, human actions also display a certain type of language, its meaning, its values and preferences of personalities. Dialogue in the cultural and educational space is a dynamic factor in its balance, establishing equal participation of subjects in preventing conflicts, destabilization and entropy.

Everyday dialogical communication outside the philosophical and non-scientific worldview positions of subjects often loses human activity and even makes it impossible for certain productive ways, means and receptions of interaction. In an effort to understand the world and another person, the person always faces new problems that require the abandonment of previous views, so the constructs allow you to gradually move in the world of objects by doing logical operations, interpreting them for mutual understanding.

This becomes most obvious when it comes to communicative and dialogic strategies, the formation of which involves a significant number of subjects in the cultural and educational space (students, teachers, scientists, heads of cultural and educational institutions, representatives of state power, local authorities self-government, political parties, religious and confessional movements, communities, public organizations, national-cultural movements, mass media, etc.).

Recognition of dialogue by the principle of theoretical and methodological support of religious practices of a particular cultural and educational space, which is the space of the peoples of the North Azov region, as well as the perception of this support by a certain (new) educational technology, requires the development of conceptual foundations of dialogical strategies. A worthy place in these developments should be to justify the theory and methodology of discursive dialogue in which religious discourse will be present along with others. Moreover, it is necessary to do this in the general cultural dialogue, as well as in interreligious and confessional communication.

It is known that interreligious communication takes place in various spheres of human life (socio-political, in which the dialogue goes between political and social leaders of countries and confessions, structures and organizations of society, socio-cultural, dialogue between different religious - social, cultural institutions, mass media, communities and groups that attain a civic level of

understanding between representatives of cultural identities, in particular religious, educational, cultural, etc., in everyday life, where positions of concrete representatives of denominations fill interpersonal relations with the use of life experience).

It should also be noted that the complexity of the dialogue in this context is also connected with the fact of the variability of relations of the newest religious movements in the world: uncompromising condemnation of secular orders, the refusal of any contact with the “sinful world” is characteristic of the initial stages of the existence of the movement. Its leaders who cannot maintain the “state of the siege of the fortress” for a long time, stay away from society. Often, the transition to a compromise form of relationship with the environment looks like a silent refusal from the previous rigid world-declarative wording.

Thus, in the interaction of these principles of scientific, philosophical, educational and religious discourse, the specificity of the educational model of interreligious dialogue and its further perspectives at the present stage becomes clear. It should be acknowledged that the dialogue is becoming more and more relevant, as in recent decades, in connection with the development of modern communications, the representatives of these two major religions have become increasingly interacting with one another. The fact of peaceful coexistence of religions and confessions today reveals the civilization potential of peacemaking of world religions, the historical role of the peacekeeping model of their relations in an increasingly globalized world, and for man the opportunity opens up to master all the richness of national and world culture and build stability in society.

By shifting the research from the methodological and the general-level to the practical level, it is necessary to recall the tremendous experience of the pedagogical management of the dialogue, known as “maieutics”. The founder should be considered Socrates, who gave the dialogue not only the features of dialectic, logical and value-sense orientations, but also considered the great art of directing it to a human and moral consensus. The “master plan” of the deployment of dialogue should become a “paternal grandmother” in search of a consensus in human relations. In cultural and educational practices, these ideas are effectively implemented by B. Bibler, N. Bourbules and other scientists and practitioners.

In our opinion, the most approaching to maieutics can be considered a way of creating and solving certain pedagogical and dialogical situations, as the modern scholars (M. Boritko, I. Kolesnikov, N. Shchurkov, and others) write. They regard the pedagogical situation as a peculiar life event for the student which contains great opportunities in the

spiritual development of a man. Problems of spiritual life of a man are first of all problems of understanding. Thus, the situation in which the interest of the student to the outside world, other people and himself is realized and fixed, is based on understanding and self-understanding.

It should be noted that the thorough theoretical and methodological basis of dialogical understanding consisted of the ideas of phenomenology of the semantic life of consciousness (E. Husserl, M. Mamardashvili, E. Fink, V. Frankl et al.), philosophical hermeneutics about the essence of understanding and self-understanding (X.-G. Gadamer, G. Dilthey, P. Rickor, F. Schlegel, and others), a reflexive philosophy that developed the problem of the orientation of man to himself and the other in the process of interaction (G. Hegel, R. Descartes, I. Kant et al.), existentialism, which explains a man as the unity and the invariable nature of its dynamic actualization (Jean-Paul Sartre, Heidegger, Karl Jaspers) philosophy of culture (M. Bakhtin, V. Bibler et al.).

The logic of the deployment of dialogic understanding situations involves the division of each type of situations into species. Information situations are divided into situations of solving ethical (controversial) tasks, ethical difficulties and valuable interpretation of subjects of dialogue, the comparison of oneself and the other, and the identification of the meanings of the life of another, the search for meaning of life and ways of helping the other.

In constructing situations of dialogical understanding, we should, in our opinion, proceed from the cognitive domination of a person in a certain structure of intellectual growth: "ignorance of ignorance", "knowledge of ignorance", "knowledge of knowledge" and value-semantic, praxeological construct of understanding, mutual understanding and interpretation of the progress of mankind.

Moreover, it should be based on the principles of creating situations of dialogical understanding, to allocate the following conditions necessary for the creation of such situations: a) the recognition of the right of existing another thought; b) openness; c) demonstration of the alienation and commonality of human individuals; d) the teacher's reaction to the information received from the interlocutor should not give an assessment; e) creating an emotional situation that promotes the discovery of a man himself, his "secret" corners of the soul; e) a common language understood by one side and the other [24].

It is in this way, according to the authors, the process of spiritual self-improvement of oneself as a unique individuality (component of goal-setting) takes place. Thanks to the cognitive component of the situation of the dialogic understanding, a man directs himself to the knowledge of himself, his spiritual capabilities (the component of experience), the

communicative component manifests itself and develops in dialogue, in interaction and is based on the understanding of oneself through the other and the other through oneself (the component of awareness), and the content contributes the realization of spiritual self-development, the transformation of the world on the principles of spirituality (a component of meaning and praxis).

In various directions of modernization of higher education, the implementation of the idea of dialogue becomes widespread in the purposefulness, content, organizational and managerial conditions of education. A significant part of teachers pays attention to the analysis of cultural and educational practices, the implementation of active methods and methods of dialogue education (integration of the principles of problem, variability in the educational process, modeling and implementation of didactic and cognitive means of learning, various forms and methods of teaching - problem lecture, dialogue micro-research, binary lecture, seminar-dialogue, lecture-discussion, internet dialogue, etc.).

The most expressive of the specifics of cultural preferences in the educational process is the religious discourse, in dialogue with which its principles are viewed: religious traditionalism; recognition of the monotheistic nature of religion; freedom of religion; recognition of the need for social cooperation for the benefit of society; moral unity and orientation of the participants in the dialogue on spirituality; the principle of peaceful coexistence on the basis of the treaty; the principle of confessional identity; the principle of anti-globalization and others.

Recently, within the limits of educational discourse, the language often refers to the polydiscursivity, the mastery of various linguistic practices (scientific, philosophical, literary, religious, etc.) in order to adequately understand the sociocultural traditions of society. In this sense, the educational discourse is presented as a leading one in multicultural dialogue [13].

In such a dialogue, representatives of various discourses seek to achieve a common, or at least transparent and understandable language, as the basis of one another's perception. Moreover, it is not only about verbal communication, but also about the motives and intentions of the person who speaks. Moreover, the culture of "assimilators" is formed in this way, which makes it possible to integrate the individual into the cultural environment and teach him to assess a complex, controversial situation from the standpoint of another culture.

With this view, one can agree if such an educational discourse functions within the cultural and educational space as a continuum of unity of science and education, education and culture, personal educational programs of the subjects of the cultural and educational space and its institutions. In

fact, this idea could be extrapolated to reality, if the creation, translation and mastering of knowledge corresponded to its true (high) content, that is semantic meaning. However, today, without the philosophical enhancement, the educational process remains largely an educational environment.

The Ukrainian scholar N. Radionova pays attention to the functional transformation of the educational space with the help of philosophy [20].

At first glance, in the educational process, especially in nonhumanitarian universities, the achievement of the goal of dialogue and the goal of communication is not realistic, since discourses sometimes reveal not only contradictory views, but also opposites in the content of the position. At the same time, their discovery and understanding of the dialogue is the beginning of a movement towards the peaceful coexistence of cultural identities, which, by the way, have a significant experience of peacemaking.

Consequently, dialogue cooperation, as a certain humanitarian technology, should direct all educational discourses into the development of a dialogue of cultures and its orientation towards philosophical reflection in the educational process. It is philosophical reflection that approximates the notion of “multicultural dialogue”, “intercultural dialogue”, “dialogue education”, “multicultural education” and other terms and even categories that function in the scientific and educational life, communication space is often contradictory to determine at least the meaning of these concepts and release them from stereotyped connotations, from falsifications and quasi-intellectual layers.

By the way, summarizing the specifics of philosophy, in particular the development of its concepts, J. Deleuze and F. Guattari emphasized: “Philosophy is neither contemplation, which essentially reflects things ... nor a reflection that arises in simple reasoning (this understanding of philosophy only diminishes its significance). Philosophy can not be identified in its entirety and with communication that “works” with thoughts in order to find consensus. It seems that the path of these universals of philosophy has already passed ... “. The leading view of Jean Deleuze and F. Guattari is represented by the statement: “We are not responsible for the victims, but guilty for the victims” [12, c.14].

Therefore, it is impossible neither deepen the multicultural dialogue nor expand its context (even with the discourse offered by Y. Habermas [10], V. Schmidt [21], V. Gosle [11] etc., and which should be carried out on the basis of rational impartiality, without giving preferences to one or another values), if:

- not to return to the Socratic understanding of the dialogue;

- not to base multiculturalism on the principle of pluralism, the recognition of equality and equal rights of all ethnic, social, political, age, religious, confessional groups, but in our opinion, if they do not allow elements of discrimination based on one or another membership;

- do not expand the dialogue around the search for the essence of the very concept of “culture” (Latin *cultura* - cultivation, education, development, domination) from its literal understanding to the totality of methods and techniques of organization, realization and search of meanings of human life, as well as to the totality of material and spiritual acquisition localized in the space and time of socio-historical formations;

- and finally, if not to “return” to the Socratic morality, human philosophy, and not to recognize in the modern context the humanity and human-dimensionality of the intercultural dialogue as criteria of culture, and thus the self-improvement of the will of a man, his loyalty to cultural values (this is what Socrates wanted to do). These positions are reflected by the author of the monograph and other authors [24].

Conclusions. As a search by the methodologist for research on dialogue in the harmonization of religious practices, consideration should be given to discussing the dialogue in the following areas:

- the search for the immanent nature of the dialogue, which prevents it from being fragmented, ensures non-interference with “objectivity” and allows the use of lateral and possible thinking in the analysis of the dialogue;

- philosophical reflection, which, in contrast to reduced scientific descriptions, represents a dialogue of a complete life phenomenon, presented in concrete events of concrete people, after all, philosophy is the art of the formation, invention and development of concepts;

- conceptualization and search of meanings that “push” the boundaries of the obvious and reveal the most incredible situations and scenarios of human life;

- discursive filling of the dialogue and additions of religious practices;

- management of dialogue of religious practices on the basis of constructive strategies, taking into account the contextuality, metaphysical orientation of one or another religious and cultural identity;

- the theoretical and methodological support of dialogue in religious practices should be based on philosophizing as an information process: the interpretation of information in a human-dimensional manner. reduction of uncertainty, increase of the volume and variety of objects of comprehension, use of the largest possible amount of information components (source, communication line, receiver, transmitter, addressee, source of interference, etc.),

use of information that is meaningful, truthful, deep, new, reliable, punctual, in value - complete, accurate, operational, optimal;

- this support should be based on philosophizing as an evaluation of information and existences in dialogue and philosophical criticism (establishing

values of views, positions, interpretation, redefining ideas, postulates, etc.).

Such a method of methodological orientation in the dialogue of religious practices will be the key to promising research and practical transformations that would prevent the “era of deep silence”.

References

1. Abuzhenko, V.L. (2003). *Understanding*. In: The New Philosophical Dictionary: 3rd ed., Corrected. Mn.: Knizhnyi dom. 767–769. [in Russian]
2. Bakhtin, M. (1979). *Aesthetics of verbal creativity*. Moscow: Iskusstvo. [in Russian]
3. Bakhtin, M.M. (1990). *Problems of Dostoevsky's creativity*. In: Makhlin V.L. Mikhail Bakhtin: The Philosophy of the Deed. Moscow: Politizdat. 49–54. [in Russian]
4. Borodina, T.V. Social dialogue: communicative strategies for the personal representation of social relations. URL: <http://cheloveknauka.com/sotsialnyy-dialog-kommunikativnye-strategii-lichnostnoy-reprezentatsii-obschestvennyh-otnosheniy#ixzz3ZHassy/> [in Russian]
5. Bulatov, M.O. (2009). *Philosophical Dictionary*. Kyiv: Stilos. [in Ukrainian]
6. Belov, I. ed. (2015). *Dialogue*. In: Head Guides. Seyiny. 559–567. [in Russian]
7. Kirvel, Ch. S. ed. (2010). *Contemporary global transformations and the problem of historical self-determination of the East Slavic peoples*. Minsk: Chetyre chetverti. 544–545. [in Russian]
8. Dobrenkova, E.V. (2007). *Social morphology of educational discourse: theoretical, methodological analysis: author's abstract*. Rostov-on-Don. [in Russian]
9. Habermas, J. (1985). *Ruckkehr zur Metaphysik. Eine Tendenz in der deutschen Philosophie?* In: Merkur, H.439/440, Oltober 1985. [in German]
10. Habermas, J. (1981). *Theorie des kommunikativen*. Bd.2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. [in German]
11. Hoslé, V. (2006). *Der Philosophical Dialogue Eine Poetik und Hermeneutik*. Munchen, Verlag C.H.Becko Hg. [in German]
12. Guattari, F. (1998). *What is philosophy?* Moscow: Int. Exper. sociology; SPb.: Aleteey. [in Russian].
13. Kendzor, P.I. (2016). *Integration through dialogue. The system of organizing multicultural education at school: [monograph]*. Lviv: Publishing House “Panorama”. [in Ukrainian].
14. Koran (1990). Tran. by I. Yu. Krachkovsky. Dushanbe. [in Russian]
15. Kozhemyakin, E.A., Krotkov, E.A. (2008). Methodological problems of the study of discourse practices. *Journal of the Institute of System Analysis, Russian Academy of Sciences*, 37, 67–72. [in Russian]
16. Krotkov, E.A., Nosova, T.V. (2009). *The nature of the philosophical (metaphysical) discourse*. In: Epistemology and the philosophy of science. No. 3, 37. [in Russian]
17. Modern philosophy: Dictionary and textbook (1957). Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix. [in Russian].
18. Zotov, A.F., Mironov, V.V., Razina, A.V. eds. (2009). *Philosophy*. Moscow: Academic Design. [in Russian].
19. Proleev, S. (2014). “Society of knowledge” as an anthropological situation. *Filosofia osvity*, 1 (14), 7–24, 7–8. [in Ukrainian]
20. Radionova, N.V. (2008). *Representation of philosophy in the educational space of Slobozhanschina in the nineteenth century*. Sumy: OJSC “SOD”, publishing house “Kozatskyval”. [in Ukrainian]
21. Schmitt, H. (1998). *Beauftragter der Stadt Mannheim für ausländische Einwohner*. In: Abschlußbericht: JUST

Список використаних джерел

1. Абушенко В. Л. Понимание. *Новейший философский словарь*. 3-е изд., исправл. Минск: Книжный Дом, 2003. 1280 с. (Мир энциклопедий). С. 767–769.
2. Бахтин М. М. Эстетика словесного творчества / сост. С. П. Бочаров. Москва: Искусство, 1979. 424 с.
3. Бахтин М. М. Проблемы творчества Достоевского. *Махлин В. Л. Михаил Бахтин: философия поступка*. Москва: Политиздат, 1990. С. 49–54 / Цит. за: Современная философия: Словарь и хрестоматия. Ростов-на-Дону: Феникс, 1997. 511 с.; С. 450.
4. Бородина Т. В. Социальный диалог: коммуникативные стратегии личностной репрезентации общественных отношений. URL :<http://cheloveknauka.com/sotsialnyy-dialog-kommunikativnye-strategii-lichnostnoy-reprezentatsii-obschestvennyh-otnosheniy#ixzz3ZHassy/> (дата звернення: 15. 06. 2019).
5. Булатов М. О. Філософський словник. Київ: Стилос, 2009. 575 с.
6. Руководство по диалогу / глав. ред. И. Белов; пер. Д. Вирен, А. Давтян, В. Окунь. Copyright by Фонд «Пограничье», Сейны, 2015. 590 с.
7. Современные глобальные трансформации и проблема исторического самоопределения восточнославянских народов / Ч. С. Кирвель и др.; под ред. д-ра философ. наук, проф. Ч. С. Кирвеля. 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. Минск: Четыре четверти, 2010. 548 с.
8. Добренкова Е. В. Социальная морфология образовательного дискурса: теоретико-методологический анализ: автореф. дисс. на соискание уч. степени д-ра социол. наук : 22.00.04. Ростов-на-Дону, 2007. 49 с.
9. Habermas J. Ruckkehr zur Metaphysik. Eine Tendenz in der deutschen Philosophie? *Merkur*. H. 439/440. Oltober, 1985. 898 ff.
10. Habermas J. Theorie des kommunikativen Handels. Bd. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1981. 348 s.
11. Hoslé V. Der Philosophical Dialogue Eine Poetik und Hermeneutik. Munchen: Verlag C. H. Becko Hg, 2006. 494 s.
12. Гваттари Ф. Что такое философия? = Qu'est-ce que la philosophie? / пер. с фр. С. Н. Зенкина; Гваттари Ф., Делёз Ж. Москва: Ин-т эксперим. социологии; Санкт-Петербург: Алетея, 1998. 260 с.
13. Кендзор П. І. Інтеграція через діалог. Система організації полікультурного виховання у школі: монографія. Львів: Видавничий Дім «Панорама», 2016. 378 с.
14. Коран / пер. И. Ю. Крачковского. Душанбе, 1990. 443 с.
15. Кожемякин Е. А., Кротков Е. А. Методологические проблемы изучения дискурсных практик. *Журнал Института системного анализа РАН*. 2008. № 37. С. 67–72.
16. Кротков Е. А., Носова Т. В. О природе философского (метафизического) дискурса. *Эпистемология и философия науки*. 2009. № 3. С. 37.
17. Современная философия: Словарь и хрестоматия. Ростов-на-Дону: Феникс, 1997. 511 с.

- Modell project fürinter kulturelle Jugendarbeit. Mannheim. [in German]
22. Schweizer, A. (1992). *Awakening to life*. Moscow: Progress. [in Russian].
 23. The Bible. Books of Scripture of the Old and New Testaments (2001). Holy Upsenskaya Pochaevskaya Lavra. [in Russian].
 24. Troitskaya, O. M. (2016). *Dialogue and Tolerance in the Cultural and Educational Space of the High School* [Monograph]. Melitopol: B. Khmelnytsky MDPU. [in Ukrainian]
 25. Troitskaya, O.M. (2017). *Principles of dialogue and tolerance in the development of modern cultural and educational space: author's abstract*. [in Ukrainian]
 26. Korporulin, V.M. (2006). *Ukrainian-Russian Psychological Explanatory Dictionary*. Kharkiv: Fakty. [in Ukrainian]
 18. Философия / под ред. А. Ф. Зотова, В. В. Миронова, А. В. Разина. 6-е изд., перераб. и доп. Москва: Академический проект, 2009. 688 с.
 19. Пролеєв С. «Суспільство знань» як антропологічна ситуація. *Філософія освіти*. 2014. № 1(14). С. 7–24.
 20. Радіонова Н. В. Репрезентації філософії в освітньому просторі Слобожанщини у ХІХ столітті. Суми: ВАТ «СОД», видавництво «Козацький вал», 2008. 320 с.
 21. Schmitt H. Beauftragter der Stadt Mannheim für ausländische Einwohner. *Abschlußbericht: JUST Modell project fürinter kulturelle Jugendarbeit*. Mannheim, 1998. S. 43.
 22. Швейцер А. Благоговение перед жизнью. Москва: Прогресс, 1992.
 23. Библия. Книги Священного Писания Ветхого и Нового Завета. Свято-Успенская Почаевская Лавра, 2001. 1367 с.
 24. Троїцька О. М. Діалог і толерантність у культурно-освітньому просторі вищої школи: монографія. Мелітополь: Вид-во МДПУ імені Б.Хмельницького, 2016. 312 с.
 25. Троїцька О. М. Принципи діалогу і толерантності у розгортанні сучасного культурно-освітнього простору :автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня д-ра філос. наук : 09.00.10.Мелітополь, 2017. 38 с.
 26. Українсько-російський психологічний тлумачний словник / авт.-упоряд. В. М. Копоруліна. Харків: Факт, 2006. 400 с.

Information about the authors:**Barantsova Iryna Oleksandrivna**

irene25@list.ru

Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky

State Pedagogical University

20 Hetmans'ka St., Melitopol, Zaporizhia region,

72312, Ukraine

Kotlyarova Viktoriya Yuriivna

Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky

State Pedagogical University

20 Hetmans'ka St., Melitopol, Zaporizhia region,

72312, Ukraine

Tkach Maryna Valeriivna

Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky

State Pedagogical University

20 Hetmans'ka St., Melitopol, Zaporizhia region,

72312, Ukraine

doi: 10.33842/22195203/2019/22/9/19

*Received at the editorial office 04. 06. 2019.**Accepted for publishing 25. 06. 2019.***Відомості про авторів:****Баранцова Ірина Олександрівна**

irene25@list.ru

Мелітопольський державний педагогічний університет

імені Богдана Хмельницького

вул. Гетьманська, 20, м. Мелітополь,

Запорізька обл., 72312, Україна

Котлярова Вікторія Юріївна

Мелітопольський державний педагогічний університет

імені Богдана Хмельницького

вул. Гетьманська, 20, м. Мелітополь,

Запорізька обл., 72312, Україна

Ткач Марина Валеріївна

Мелітопольський державний педагогічний університет

імені Богдана Хмельницького

вул. Гетьманська, 20, м. Мелітополь,

Запорізька обл., 72312, Україна

doi: 10.33842/22195203/2019/22/9/19

*Матеріал надійшов до редакції 04. 06. 2019 р.**Прийнято до друку 25. 06. 2019 р.*