

THE INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE AS THE BASIS OF PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

Barantsova Iryna Olexandrivna

PhD, Associate Professor

Bohdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University

Kotlyarova Viktoriya Yuriivna

PhD, Associate Professor

Bohdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University

Tkach Maryna Valerivna

Senior Teacher

Bohdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University

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.

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” [5, c.37].

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 [3, 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;
- the principle of socialization;
- the principle of personal development;

- the principle of the unity of the educational space;
- the principle of educational competence;
- the principle of polydiscursiveness.

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 cannot 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 cannot 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 [6, 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 [2, 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” [4].

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 cannot 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.

References:

1. Abuzhenko V.L. Understanding / The New Philosophical Dictionary: 3rd ed., Corrected. - Mn.: Book House, 2003. - 1280 pp. - (World of Encyclopedias). - S. 767-769., P. 767. (in Russian)
2. Bulatov M.O. Philosophical Dictionary / M.O. Bulatov. - K .: Stilos, 2009. - 575 pp., P. 522. (in Russian)
3. Dobrenkova E.V. Social morphology of educational discourse: theoretical,_methodological analysis: author's abstract. diss ... doc. sociologist sciences - Rostov-on-Don, 2007. - P. 14. (in Russian)
4. Habermas J. Ruckkehr zur Metaphysik. – Eine Tendenz in der deutschen Philosophie? In: Merkur, H.439/440, Oltober 1985. – 898 ff. (in German)
5. Krotkov E.A., Nosova T.V. The nature of the philosophical (metaphysical) discourse // Epistemology and the philosophy of science. - 2009. - No. 3. - P. 37. (in Russian)
6. Modern philosophy: Dictionary and textbook. - Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix, 1957. - 511 pp., P. 148. (in Russian)