

UDC:378.147

**Lytvynova O.V.**

*PhD of Pedagogical Sciences, associate professor, of Dnipro State University  
of Agriculture and Economics, litvinova20@ukr.net*

*Ukraine, Dnipro*

## **THE HEART CONCEPT OF SUCH PHENOMENON AS «DIALOG CULTURE» IN PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL RESEARCHES**

The article deals with the phenomenon «dialog culture» in psychological and pedagogical researches. The attempt of component structure analysis of phenomenon «dialog culture» has been made. The article outlines the main aspects of the study of the concept of «dialogue», the main scientific approaches to the definition of the concept of dialogue in the culturological aspect are considered, and essence of the concept of «culture of dialogue» in psychological and pedagogical research is revealed.

**Keywords:** teacher, student, dialog, levels of the dialog, culture, aspects, culture aspect, dialog culture, the culture of personality, forming of dialog culture.

***Литвинова О.В.***

*к.пед. н., доцент кафедри філології Дніпровського державного аграрно-економічного університету, litvinova20@ukr.net*

*Україна, Дніпро*

## **СУТНІСТЬ ПОНЯТТЯ «КУЛЬТУРА ДІАЛОГУ» В ПСИХОЛОГО-ПЕДАГОГІЧНИХ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯХ**

У статті розглядається феномен «культура діалогу » у психолого-педагогічних дослідженнях. Зроблено спробу аналізу компонентної структури явища «культура діалогу». У статті висвітлено основні аспекти вивчення поняття «діалог», розглянуті основні наукові підходи до визначення поняття діалогу в культурологічному аспекті, а також сутність поняття «культура діалогу» у психолого-педагогічних дослідженнях.

**Ключові слова:** педагог, учень, діалог, рівні діалогу, культура, аспекти,

аспект культури, діалогова культура, культура особистості, формування культури діалогу.

**Actuality of the theme** appeared due to the modern needs of higher education in the training of qualified specialists with a high level of culture of dialogue communication.

**Analysis of recent research and publications on the topic.** The research of the essence of the concept of dialogue, the culture of dialogue in the process of training and education of the person engaged in such scholars as: Sukhomlinsky V., Orban-Lembryk L., Bech I., Dobrovich O., Vitvitskaya S., Litovskii V., Alitsiia Anna Kotusevich, Nefyodova N., Serdyuk O., Serdyuk O., Rean O., Volkova N., Batrakova S., Palichata E., Korniyaka O., Antonov V., Murashov O., Kan-Kalik V. .

**The purpose of the article** is to outline the main aspects of the study of the concept of «dialogue»; to consider basic scientific approaches to the definition of the concept of dialogue in the culturological aspect; to reveal the essence of the concept of «culture of dialogue» in psychological and pedagogical research.

**Presentation of the main research material.** The methodological basis of the study is the study of the concept of «culture of dialogue» in the linguistic, psychological, philosophical, pedagogical, psychological, pedagogical and cultural aspects, since dialogue as a complex social phenomenon can be understood only from the standpoint of a systematic approach. Thus, the methodological analysis of the essence of the dialogue reveals its effective nature, the polemical nature, the varied nature of its forms, and the dialectics of the main components of the dialogue. Characteristics of its structure is the dialogic relations, dialogical positions of subjects of dialogical communication, the subject of dialogue, the effect of dialogue, etc. The philosophical aspect of the study of dialogue reveals the morphology of dialogue.

From the standpoint of the psychological aspect of the dialogue - it is a mutual influence, interaction, mutual psychological event. The linguistic aspect of the dialogue characterizes it as the speech, the linguistic creativity of the interacting people. [11; p.28 - 29.] The cultural aspect of the study of dialogue determines ways of interaction of people in communication, based on norms, traditions, national identity of society. [9; p. 405-408] The pedagogical aspect of the study of dialogue characterizes it as an action in the pedagogical process, which gives each partner the opportunity of self-expression in communication. [10; p.116]

A number of traditional disciplines, including such as ethnomethodology, social psychology, literary studies, linguistics, are connected with the study of dialogue. [8; p.107]

Within ethnomethodology there are rituals of conversation as a category of this or that ethnoculture. The study focuses on the following problems: what is the reason for speech communication of people; how is the right to replicate distributed; in what sequence and to what extent are the right to replicate the subjects of speech communication.

In social psychology, analogous categories of analysis are used for the study of social groups of small groups. The study of such guidelines is the analysis of speech interaction, in which the quantitative criteria are: the number of typical forms of replica exchange, the length of the replica, the length of the speech situation, etc. The main structural element of analysis - the speech contribution of the speaker, the main psychological study - the regulation of the exchange of replicas.

Literature studies the communicative relations between the author and the reader of the text, and any literary text interprets the exchange of thoughts on various aspects of a topic that underlies multilateral intertextual relations, as a polyphonic one.

In linguistics, predominantly, dialogues are explored within the framework of the conversation of two or more speakers and identify the types of particularities of

communication in conversation. The possibilities of adapting the traditional linguistic principles of analysis (for example, syntactic) to the study of relationships within the framework of the conversation are elucidated. All these areas of study combine understanding of dialogue as a speech form.

Meanwhile, in the culturological aspect, the concept of "dialogue" has a much broader meaning. For our topic, the direction of psychological and pedagogical thought is important, within which a general rethinking of the status of dialogue in the processes of cognition is carried out and tracing the dialogical foundations of thinking and being in all its manifestations.

Researchers associate the phenomenon of «culture» with the concept of «development», its essence is the process of human creation, because the important product of culture is the man himself. Hence, a person of culture is a humane person. Humanity is the queen of morality, in which love for people involves charity, sensitivity, kindness, sympathy, care, understanding and their protection. A man of culture - a spiritually rich personality, who has creative abilities, devoted to his work, captured by her. A man of culture is a creative person who constantly thinks, thinks alternative, dissatisfied with the achievements he has gained, is endowed with developed desire for creation. A man of culture is an independent person capable of self-determination in the world of culture. Independence of judgments in conjunction with respect for the views of other people, a sense of self-respect, the ability to navigate the world of spiritual values in the environment, the ability to make decisions and bear the responsibility for their actions, to make an independent choice of the content of their life, the power of behavior, ways of development. [4; p. 80]

Despite the large number of definitions of the notion of «culture», one can distinguish the following main provisions: the essence of culture - humanistic, creative person, which is to specify human values in relation to each person; product and at the same time the creator of culture is a man; the main source of culture is human activity; culture includes methods and results of human activity; culture is seen as a mechanism that regulates and regulates human behavior and activities, since a person is a carrier and a repeater; culture is a specifically human way of being,

which determines the entire spectrum of practical and spiritual activity of man, of his possible interaction with the outside world and himself. Spiritual culture is the epicenter of personality. [4; p.79]

Consequently, personal culture is a process of accumulation of knowledge, experience and qualitative implementation of their activities and behavior. The personality culture is both a state and a result, and a productive process of assimilation and creation of social values. It implies the development and harmony of all components and their integral formation in activities. [4; p. 80]

The culture of communication is an integral part of a person's culture and the social environment in which its interaction with its like is taking place. The culture of pedagogical communication includes linguistic culture, communicability, empathy, benevolence, tolerance, image, respect for human dignity, ability to express their own thoughts and listen to the interlocutor. [7; p.98-99]

But the principal, essential characteristic of pedagogical communication in its humanistic, ethical aspects is the dialogue. The dialogue includes judgments, points of view, personal stances reflecting aspects of understanding, appreciation and emotional attitude.

The opening of the dialogue as a certain idea of culture, noted Yachin S.E., Orlov M.Yu. [12; p.142-148], belongs to the present and means the first and necessary step to the problem of the mode of communication. Prior to that, it was only a form for the preservation and development of other content and how such an idea remained invisible to those who thought and lived in its forms. But the fact that the basic philosophical and cultural texts were composed in a dialogue mode was perceived as a natural state of things (for example, «Dialogues» of Socrates, Plato), which is why the possibilities of dialogue were not problematised. [12; p.144]

The solution of the tasks of forming the phenomenon of a culture of dialogue is impossible without studying its essence and structure. Investigating the ideal dialogical situation, Ianin S.E., Orlov M.Yu. distinguish in the dialogue the so-called «registers of the regime». The dialogue, according to the definition of scholars, unfolds on several levels, or in several registers: ontological, eczestinal, cultural and

instrumental (social), where the cultural register is first of all connected with the search for cultural expressions common to this society, this is a symbolic expression means of existence, existence. [12; p.147]

Interesting opinion of the Alitsiia Anna Kotusevich on the question of the culture of dialogue. The researcher, based on the works of such scholars as Z. Freud, G. Marcuse, N.O. Brown, M. Buber, proposes to consider the culture of dialogue inseparably from the culture of violence. [1; p. 27-35]

As the researcher points out, in the everyday thinking the concept of dialogue is associated with linguistic communication, with the conversation, the coordination of the common position, the place. These forms of communication deactivate the need for pressure and violence on the partner or the act of communication that is taking place. Repression, by contrast, is associated with a dominant, sometimes forceful, behavior, directed to subjugation or appropriation of another. The culture of pressure Kotusevich opposes the culture of dialogue, positively evaluating it. [1; p. 27]

Every power is exposed to the temptation of appropriation. Teacher also Teaching disposition is not exempt from such temptation. Therefore, the questions that we put ourselves in teaching activities should be related to the legitimacy of interference in the consciousness of young people. We must ask ourselves about the degree and form of intellectual and emotional «capture» of this consciousness, the value of the educational proposal, the meaning of what we do, that in a particular situation it is really necessary to do. [1; p. 28]

Here, in the opinion of the researcher, there are two possible options as two teacher's topos: a pragmatic topos, referring to «solid» values, incitement, expansion, domination, pressure, as well as a humanistic topos based on the dialog forms of educational contact with the student, that is, is accentuated on interaction as a value. [1; p. 28] The above-mentioned topos remain in the interconnection, and the inversion between them does not seem possible - there is a possibility to choose.

Similarly, in anthropological studies of culture, pressure, coercion and dialogue in education are subject to interdependence. Dialogue is difficult to save without the prior introduction of a system of rules and regulations. In the history of pedagogical

thought this problem has been repeatedly raised and discussed. She acquired forms of discussion about coercion, freedom and independence in upbringing (A.S. Neil, G. Marcuse, N.O. Brown).

But Alitsiia Anna Kotusevich notes that cultural pressure plays an important role in orientation in the world, is part of the universe of self-awareness and understanding of reality. On this basis, it is possible to build a dialogue structure, as well as a certain socio-cultural order. Dialogue and pressure appear as two poles interdependent in their movement. Their separation is impossible without delaying that movement. [1; p. 30]

The solution of the tasks of forming the phenomenon of a culture of dialogue is impossible without studying its essence and structure. We believe that the concept of «culture of dialogue» is based on dialogue, as a form of external and internal interaction of the individual with the outside world.

Dobrovich O. distinguishes the following levels of dialogue in communication: conventional level, primitive level, manipulative level, standardized level, game level, business level, spiritual level. [6; p. 182-216] Thus, according to Dobrovich O., the dialogue between people can take place at any of these levels, but the culture of dialogue, according to Dobrovich, «is not to conduct a dialogue with a constant looking (not going to a level below the conventional one), but that, at any level that occurs in a real conversation, both interlocutors retained the opportunity to rise to the conventional and higher levels - even to the spiritual.» [6; p. 211]

The formation of a culture of dialogue in student youth occurs both in the learning process and in non-auditing work. The basis of the work on the formation of a culture of dialogue is a human-oriented personally oriented system of education, which defines the directions of the formation of man from the position of universal values, takes into account the specific features of the national environment (historical, spiritual, cultural, religious, linguistic, etc.), has a democratic and humanistic orientation and creates conditions for the full development of a future specialist, his becoming a top-notch professional. [5; p.69]

«Culture, in its basis, is pedagogical,» said S. Batrakov, «and the culture of

dialogue in its educational and educational function is based on the analogy and taking into account those forms and models of communication that have developed in culture. Art, game, all forms of personality transformation in culture are of great interest and are used in the development of pedagogical communication. In dialogue between teacher and students it is important not to be limited to a range of educational and cognitive problems, but to combine them organically with those aspects of the development of science, which lead to human understanding, explain humans in a person, give impulses for self-development, self-determination of man culture and culture.» [2; p.27-28]

Not seclusion, on the contrary - the openness of dialogue in which the student finds himself in solving the most important human problems - contributes to the formation of his inner world.

The culture of dialogue includes the ability to listen, to ask questions, to analyze the answer, to understand another, to be attentive, observant, to establish contact, to see and understand the reaction of the audience, to communicate their attitude to what is being discussed, to interest, to capture an explanation, to navigate the situation. For a teacher with a high culture of dialogical communication are: optimality of requirements; pedagogical optimism; emotional response; the formation of collective forms of relations, relations in the team in the educational process; creating an atmosphere of benevolence. However, no matter how attractive the model of relationship teacher and student, it is always dynamic. With this in mind, a good teacher always strives for the continuity of his education and training, he constantly analyzes his activities, identifies the level of interaction with students, adopts and uses new achievements of pedagogical science and best practices, takes the best from his colleagues. [3; p. 90-91]

**Conclusions.** The analysis of the essence of the concept of "culture of dialogue" made by us makes it possible to draw the conclusion that within the framework of the cultural approach the study of dialogue implements its direct educational and educational value: the relation to another person as a value, understanding of each other's partners, mutual perception, mutual understanding, mutual influence,



openness, benevolence, mutual trust, tolerance, humanization of relationships, the ability to organize communicative activity in the forms enshrined in the rules and norms of the culture of behavior, made by society.

### **Literature**

1. Аліція Анна Котусевич Діалог у структурі навчальних відносин зі студентом. // Вісник Львівського Університету. Сер.пед. – 2005. – Вип.19, Ч. 1.
2. Батракова С. Педагогическое общение как диалог в культуре. // Педагогика, 2002, №4.
3. Вітвицька С.С. Основи педагогіки вищої школи: Методичний посібник для студентів. – К., 2003.
4. Вітвицька С.С. Практикум з педагогіки вищої школи. – К., 2005.
5. Виховна робота зі студентською молоддю. /Навчальний посібник за ред.. Т.Ю. Осипової. /– Одеса, 2006.
6. Добрович А.Д. Анатомія діалога // Хрестоматія по педагогической психології.- М., 1995.
7. Мачуська І.М. Формування культури спілкування суб'єктів навчально-виховного процесу. / Педагогіка і психологія. – 1997. - №3.
8. Медінцев В.О. Деякі теоретичні джерела діалогічного підходу у психології. // Практична психологія та соціальна робота. - №9-10, 2003.
9. Орбан-Лембрик Л.Е. Соціальна психологія. – Київ, 2004. - кн.1.
10. Педагогічна майстерність: Підручник/за ред.. І.А. Зязюна./ – К., 2004.
11. Руденский Е.В. Основы психотехнологии общения менеджера. – М., 1997.
12. Ячин С.Е., Орлова М.Ю. Диалог как коммуникативный режим. // Человек. - №5. – 2001.

### **References**

1. Alitsiia Anna Kotusievych Dialoh u strukturі navchalnykh vidnosyn zi

- studentom. // Visnyk Lvivskoho Universytetu. Ser.ped. – 2005. – Vyp.19, Ch. 1.
2. Batrakova S. Pedagogicheskoe obshchenye kak dialoh v kulture. // Pedagogika, 2002, №4.
  3. Vitvytska S.S. Osnovy pedagogiky vyshchoi shkoly: Metodichni posibnyk dlia studentiv. – K., 2003.
  4. Vitvytska S.S. Praktikum z pedagogiky vyshchoi shkoly. – K., 2005.
  5. Vykhovna robota zi studentskoiu moloddiu. /Navchalnyi posibnyk za red.. T.Yu. Osypovoi. /– Odesa, 2006.
  6. Dobrovych A.D. Anatomia dialoha // Khrestomatyia po pedagogicheskoi psykholohii.- M., 1995.
  7. Machuska I.M. Formuvannia kultury spilkuvannia sub'ektiv navchalno-vykhovnoho protsesu. / Pedagogika i psykholohiia. – 1997. - №3.
  8. Medintsev V.O. Deiaki teoretychni dzherela dialohichnoho pidkhodu u psykholohii. // Praktychna psykholohiia ta sotsialna robota. - №9-10, 2003.
  9. Orban-Lembryk L.E. Sotsialna psykholohiia. – Kyiv, 2004. - kn.1.
  10. Pedagogichna maisternist: Pidruchnyk/za red.. I.A. Ziaziuna./ – K., 2004.
  11. Rudenskyi E.V. Osnovy psikhotekhnologyy obshchenyia menedzhera. – M., 1997.
  12. Yachyn S.E., Orlova M.Yu. Dialoh kak kommunikatyvnyi rezhym. // Chelovek. - №5. – 2001.