

CULTUROLOGICALLY-ORIENTED TEACHING OF STUDENTS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN MODERN SOCIETY

В статті окреслено шляхи оволодіння студентами іноземною мовою як засобом міжкультурного спілкування. Обґрунтовано особливості впливу діалогічної стратегії з метою ефективного навчання студентів іноземним мовам. Охарактеризовано культуру як діалогічне спілкування. Сформульовано психологічні чинники ефективності культурологічно зорієнтованого навчання іноземним мовам у вищій школі.

Ключові слова: *культура, культурологічно зорієнтоване навчання, міжкультурне спілкування, діалогічне спілкування, діалогічна стратегія.*

In this article the ways of mastering a foreign language as a mean of intercultural communication were shown. The features of the influence of dialogic strategies to the effective process of teaching students foreign languages were proved. The culture as dialogue communication was characterized. Psychological factors of the efficiency of culturally oriented learning of foreign languages in high school were determined.

Key words: *the culture culturally oriented studying, intercultural communication, dialogue communication, dialogic strategy.*

Speaking about the importance of learning foreign languages for the successful development of a free and independent country that actually build the state of new social, economic and political structures we certainly have in mind that learning any language will contribute to the comprehensive development of the individual, because it creates conditions for free communication, opens us different ways for human access to the treasures of wisdom and life experience, thus speeding up the progress of society. Ukraine currently requires qualified professionals with knowledge of two, three or four foreign languages, professionals who are able to absorb all new and progressive, ready for generation and introduction of fresh and original ideas, but also beneficial to participate in international cooperation and the formation of a new attitude towards Ukraine in Europe and the whole world.

The course on humanization of education is carried out in our country, causes rejection of narrow pragmatic purposes of learning a foreign language. The modern concept of learning a foreign language is seen as a reflection of culture of the people, and mastering a foreign language as mastery of foreign culture and assimilation of global cultural values.

Therefore the problem of culturally oriented learning as an effective factor in mastering a foreign language is very topical at the present stage of the development of psychological science.

The *purpose* of this article is: to analyze the psychological literature on this issue and highlight the main factors of the efficiency of culturally oriented learning a foreign language by students.

The *objectives* of the article are:

1. To show ways of mastering a foreign language as a mean of intercultural communication.

2. To prove features of the influence of dialogic strategies to the effective process of teaching students foreign languages.
3. To characterize culture as dialogue communication.
4. To determine psychological factors of the efficiency of culturally oriented learning of foreign languages in high school.

Thus, the social background of modern education involves not only the formation skills and abilities of students who study a foreign language, but also introducing a language of culture of the country, its traditions, history and modernity. This means the inclusion of the individual in the dialogue that can later develop into a dialogue of cultures, nations and nationalities, in the dialogue of humanity.

One of the successful attempts to approach the learning process to a real life is called “culture directed mastery of foreign languages” (according to the terminology of L.Smelyakova). The feasibility of this direction based on the fact that these days the teaching materials are often based not on purely linguistic material, which is often culturally oriented, communicative, but the teacher has to orient on the personal approach in the educational process.

Mastering a foreign language as a mean of intercultural communication is impossible without the simultaneous study of culture of the country. According to O.Kornylov “if the culture understands everything that does and thinks the nation, then it captures how the nation thinks” [1 : 81]. According to G.Brown culture is the context within which we exist, think, feel and communicate with each other [2]. We can say that we can, on the one hand, reflect the specificity of people who think, and on the other, by B.Whorf, we can understand man’s outlook and make other people to think about and behavior of each individual [3]. Here’s why you should organize the process of studying in such a way that learning foreign languages can be a phenomenon of national culture and as a result it can ensure intercultural communication and understanding in a great degree, and it can give a lot of opportunities to participate in the dialogue of different cultures. It is clear that this problem is not only a methodological or linguistic one, but also social and psychological.

The function of socialization is a synthetic one that integrates and organizes all the others. The process of socialization consists of a system of individual assimilation of knowledge, norms and values (so, the culture in its various forms), which allows it to act as a real member of a society. So, about the last person who had a tradition of creative intelligence Cantor says as about “logical multiplicity” abilities. In Hellenistic and later in medieval philosophy this question was discussed, because cognitive abilities can be understood as “a mind” – ability to maintain deductive and inductive line of thinking, “intuition” – both internal capability fusion vision “eyes of the mind”. In dialogues by Nicholas Cusanskyi monolog and control are thought consciously as a field of mind [4].

Martin Buber develops the idea of “meeting”, “dialogue”, “I” and “You” as absolutely equal entities. The central idea of philosophy of M.Buber – being as a dialogue between God and Man, Man and the World. Philosopher concludes, based on the existing biblical tradition: the life of people is in dialogue of each person with other people. This dialogue is creative, “saving” if it is organized accordance to the precepts of morality and love. In this dialogue it is turned out the vitality of God [5].

In the book “I and You” M.Buber raises the problem of human relationships. Man, according to M.Buber, can not say anything about himself until he doesn’t carry himself with the

“Other”. The masterpiece of Buber is the idea of absolute equal positions of “I” and “You”. This point of view told V.Hote and M.Bakhtin but M.Buber developed the idea of “meeting”, “dialogue” in more details [5].

Dialogue, according to M.Bakhtin, implies the existence of a man in a culture with value-semantic architectural centre, around which there are a lot of speech and there are not anything which can be expressed in words, emotionally or sounding “under the text”, “implicitly”, emerging intonation tone. Such kind of interaction occurs as a meeting of various minds and their bodies – the bodies of the man and the culture. Dialogue is not always the agreement, it means the understanding, misunderstanding, speaking and silence. Dialogue involves returning to his/her seat in its value system, and the person will have the ability to enrich another system (knowledge), to help another person (ethical action), see with morality, complete his/her actions from positions outside (from an aesthetic ratio) [6].

To understand the world thinks M.Bakhtin can only that person who perceives the event as co-being of “I” and “another” – and then there is a possible valuable position outside of me as an aesthetic condition. For the philosopher the world is filled with voices, foreign words, emotional intonations, and silence that speaks, that is recognized and is not recognized. It is the dialogical world of cultures and person in it is a significant value regardless of social status, intellectual development. Based on the discovery of F.Dostoevskiy M.Bakhtin shows that the human “I” at any time does not coincide with itself; dialogue takes place between the end zones and is incomplete, open to debate. But man’s dialogs are not only in the sphere in which “I” exist because of the “Other” man, his eyes, ears, estimates. On the other hand, according to M.Bakhtin, a person gets a name, intonation, emotional tone of values: “Man’s consciousness awakes under consciousness of another person” [6 : 318]. But “I” is not “widespread” in another person, is not just connected with his/her level of feelings: between subjects should be misobjective space or distance which is relative in vitality. Live does not mean personification itself, or restructuring of shorting, dissolving in the team: “Live means to engage in dialogue – ask, listen, respond, agree, etc. In this dialogue a person participates in all degree and all his/her life: with the eyes, lips, hands, soul, spirit, whole body, acts. It accommodates itself to the word, and that word is in dialogical matter of human life, in the world symposium” [6 : 318]. Thus man knows himself, personified.

The central aesthetic and psychological idea of M.Bakhtin is, at first, the position of “being out of space”, in such kind of relations to the subject of artistic representation that includes “use experience”, internal merger of the subject and, at the same time, can cover it in the whole “from his place in the existence” and “can be put” to “significant foreign body” – a distinct art form that develop your inner self every moment of his own existence. In his philosophy of action M.Bakhtin develops the idea that the world culture that belongs to a particular living person as “ready” abstract semantic unit, “if I were not” [7], by itself, does not include rights to have arrangements to “think and act in accordance with those values universally scientific, aesthetic, socially planned”. According to these values, it is necessary that the man himself felt and accepted the act of “free and responsible inclusion” to some other culture, to “its single life”. Then theoretically meaningful values of culture seems to erupt from the “candles” of individual and unique human essence, “culturally reproduced in vivo” [7 : 108] and man “from his own place in being” brings something new to the culture.

Thus, due to the central task of the psychology of creativity we can determine that to be a creative person we have to learn in various fields of culture itself and in our possible future, and we have to make some desire to lure them into our own life. Then the specific psychological and educational technology, based on ideas of L. Vyhotskyi, M. Bakhtin, V. Bibler will apply in full force as the main means of actualization of creative abilities.

Ideas of M. Buber found its mark in the approach to Moscow psychologist H. Kovalov, so, in his research about types of interpersonal influence and interaction [8].

H. Kovalov considers the following impacts: the imperative influence; manipulative effect; dialogical influence.

Based on the concept of H. Kovalov about the existence of monological and dialogical points of interpersonal interaction, H. Ball and M. Burhin propose two main types of strategies influence in psychology – monologue and dialogic [9].

A subject who uses only monologue strategy behaves as a full subject and a carrier of truth, and the recipient is in complete subordination of the first one and executes all actions in accordance with the subject of the influence. Dialogic strategy recognizes subjective usefulness and the fundamental equality of interacting partners, regardless of their social status.

Within monologue type of strategies and interactions identify there are two subtypes: imperative; manipulative. Imperative effect corresponds to a reactive approach of the object of the influence.

Implementation of the strategy is imperative where people for some reason have limited capacity for doing selection of actions or making decisions. Imperative strategy implies that an effect completely directs the activity of the recipient to perform certain actions for achieving the desired result. Manipulative effect corresponds to a valuable approach.

As a result of compliance with manipulative strategies the aim is to impact achieved through active actions of the object which are instead declared from the beginning, but this organized activity influences the person in the desired direction for him.

The most effective is the dialogic strategy that takes into account the whole business. Although monological effect does not exclude dialogue between subjects and objects, but the first is not focused on the dialogic (there are not fully subject-subject relations). If the dialogue is well organized, it has only official, methodical function, and in any case does not involve changes in the subject's position of influence.

So, H. Ball and M. Burhin showed that the principal feature of the monologue influence is in the attitude to another person as it means to achieve the goals identified an impact. In the process of dialogic interaction communication partners are on equal positions, they help each other. Dialogue shows psychological conditions of this strategy impact. H. Kovalov provides some basis norms and principles of dialogic influence:

- emotional and personal “opening” of partners of interaction;
- psychological orientation to the actual conditions of each other;
- trust and open expression of feelings and states.

Therefore, in the dialogue two individuals begin to form a common psychological space and time length, forming emotional “being together” in which interaction in general object, monologic sense has no longer exists, and on its place appear psychological unity of subjects. These are the conditions of human existence contribute to the development of their creativity and reveal personality.

Dialog has a positive effect on the emergence and the development of contacts between people. H.Kovalov believes that dialogue is the highest level of communication because it is characterized by a positive personal attitude of subjects to each other, their “open” treatment and behavior relative to the communication partner.

Indisputable is the fact that the dialogic interaction of a teacher and a student during the process of studying promotes internal dialogue in the mind of partners of communicating, which in turn has a positive effect on the mental and personal development of students.

Dialogical approach, says H.Ball, provides for students individual right to have their own point of view, their own position to which the teacher treats with respect. Under these conditions, the organization of training activities of students can freely develop them as a person.

Monologue and dialogic strategies of psychology of influence have their ideological significance and correlate with epistemological and social ideas. H.Ball, A.Volynets and S.Copylov note that in these policies there are manifested some ideas, interpretation of truth, namely: 1) authoritarian (including totalitarian) idea; 2) the liberal idea; 3) the humanist idea [10].

Following the first approach, the entity considers only his understanding of the idea, object, action, etc. right and other people’s opinions – wrong. The second approach entitles each subject to understand the truth of his/her own position, given the individual views and opinions. Understanding the truth as a dialogue is concerned with humanistic idea and has main influences with the help of which dialogic strategy provides principles of real equality and interdependence of subjects. This means, above all, focus on culture and dialogue, dialogue reflexive, which primarily serves as a mechanism of functioning the culture.

Culture is primarily a dialogue for effective communication. M.Bakhtin in his works says about the dialogue between peoples, nations, cultures, their mutual understanding based on the unity of humanity and cultures, which opened at the big time. Culture can only enter into dialogue when there are new questions which are formulated differently than the culture put them itself. In this great dialogue of cultures its sides and deep, unknown to itself, opens. Without such issues that go with other cultures, as well as to communicate between “I” and “Other” can be a dialogue and creative understanding. If there is a “meeting” of two cultures (according to M.Bakhtin), they “do not merge and mingle, each maintains its unity and integrity of the open, but they are mutually enriched”. V.Bibler notes that, for example, ancient culture continues to live in the next century, almost every culture develops logic and meaningful dialogue with others. For Ukrainian culture, H.Zhurskyi emphasizes, it can not be understood without the ancient, Byzantine, Russian, Belarusian, Polish, Lithuanian, German, Jewish, Armenian and other cultures [11].

So, we have identified the following types of dialogical interactions, regardless of which language teacher in high school will contribute to improve organization of dialogic interaction of learning activities and understanding of future teachers of literature. These types of dialogical interactions are:

- **subordinative dialogism** emphasizes the recognition of undeniable superiority of the author’s works than his beliefs, positions, opinions and views. So, the part of subordinative dialogism is subject oriented component, the main in which is the perception of a certain content of the message of another person, which, unfortunately, often leads to subjugate another person, uncritical approval of his/her judgments, etc.;

- **coordinative dialogism** that unlike subordinative focuses not on the personal aspect, both on procedural interaction in the broadest sense of the word. In the first place there is the

richness of dialogue responses, their sequence, interdependence and complementarity. Coordinative dialogism provides subject-discursive component as a rational justification for the subject's own point of view, certainly also implies tolerance for the views of the interlocutor, but this view is always dominant, of course, has its own hypothesis, positions, opinions, etc.;

- **personal and reflexive dialogism** involves considering individual subjectivity of the companion, which in this case is the subject of a literary work. This type of dialogism is the most profound in the content of due to understanding the partner of the communication. Subjectivity in this case raises the determinant of a person's own vision of its position that involves the development of a critical attitude of students to their point of view and thoughts of partners in dialogue, the ability to understand and recognize speech and communication of partners (especially if the person is the author of a literary work) justify their own opinions, ask questions, formulate doubt, contribute new ideas and suggestions, express unconventional, original thoughts, correct statements of other participants, in the communication use the same time they are acceptable.

According to the characteristics of students, and especially understanding the peculiarities of culturally oriented studies, we have identified three key components of reading activity of future teachers according to reading them novels, stories, fiction, etc. There are three components in the process of reading activity by future teachers. They are:

- **cognitive component**, which has in its structure: a) semantic reading; b) interpretive reading; c) sense reading;

- **communicative component**, consisting of: a) the process of communication between the author of the novel and the reader's own experience; b) orientation of the student on the process of co-creation with other readers and awareness of the possibility of feedback; c) transforming the content of a literary work, that means the interpretation in general and the interpretation based on your own understanding;

- **subject-oriented component**, which is based on: a) the motivation of the person in reading novels; b) the development of the reader's own vision of his/her individual positions in the process of reading the novels, formation such kind of "personal meanings"; c) the ability to bring the interpretation of the text into the reader's personal sense; d) the ability to perceive the point of view of another subject of communication about the reading of a literary work; e) the possibility to transfer the reader's understanding of literary works into the artistic structure, such as a poetic message.

All these issues directly relate to education, and, above all, literary education, because in the texts of fiction the culture represented in the most concentrated view. The texts help to see the culture of our country – Ukraine – in the deep inner dialogue, in conjunction with other cultures round the whole world. It helps to understand Ukrainian culture as a part of a great culture, a culture of the whole world civilization.

Thus, we anticipate that the effectiveness of psychological factors culturally based on learning foreign languages. The factors of the effectiveness of culturally oriented studying can be considered:

1. To make up classroom conditions for effective dialogic communication of students at the lessons of foreign language.

2. To make a model of micro-situations for free inclusion of students into a particular cultural community.

3. To organize effective subject-subject interaction between students, which greatly contributes to the process of socialization and acculturation.

No doubt the fact that at foreign language lessons we can not create full objective picture of a foreign world and its culture. Everyone should not underestimate the possibility to simulate the world of foreign language culture with varying degrees of completeness and complexity.

From a socio-psychological point of view of human personality learners should be prepared to secondary acculturation and intercultural communication and understanding. This commitment is manifested in such personality traits that are objective and training in intercultural communication, and the condition to reach success of such a communication, and the result of intercultural communication, even if it is specially organized for all classmates.

So, thanks to the many components of culture, maximum involvement into the learning process creates a qualitatively new atmosphere that is as close to real communication and it is the most conducive to efficiency mastering a foreign language.

LITERATURE

1. Корнилов О.А. Языковые модели мира / О.А. Корнилов // Россия и Запад: диалог культур. – М., 1994. – С. 81.

2. Brown G. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching / G. Brown. – San Francisco : S. Fr. State University, 1987. – 277 p.

3. Whorf B.L. Language, Thought and Reality / B.L. Whorf. – Cambridge : Cambridge Mass “M.I.T”, 1967. – 127 p.

4. Библер В.С. Мышление как творчество : Введение в логику мысленного диалога / Владимир Соломонович Библер. – М. : Политиздат, 1975. – 399 с.

5. Бубер М. Я и ТЫ / Мартин Бубер. – М. : Высшая школа, 1993. – 176 с.

6. Бахтин М.М. Эстетика словесного творчества : [сб. избр. тр.] / Михаил Михайлович Бахтин / [примеч. С.С. Аверинцева, С.Г. Бочарова]. – М. : Искусство, 1979. – 423, [1] с. – (Из истории советской эстетики и теории искусства).

7. Бахтин М.М. К философии поступка / Михаил Михайлович Бахтин // Философия и социология науки и техники. – М. : Наука, 1986. – С. 80–160.

8. Ковалёв Г.А. О системе психологического воздействия : Психология воздействия / Григорий Александрович Ковалёв. – М. : Наука, 1989. – 368 с.

9. Балл Г.А. Анализ психологического воздействия и его педагогическое значение / Г.А. Балл, М.С. Бургин // Вопросы психологии. – 1994. – № 4. – С. 56–66.

10. Балл Г.О. Диалого-культурологічний підхід як напрям гуманізації освіти / Г.О. Балл, А.Г. Волинець, С.О. Копилов // Психологія – школі : зб. матер. Другого міжрегіон. наук. практ. семінару (Рівне, 16-18 січня, 1997 року). – К., 1997. – С. 16–18, 76–82.

11. Диалогічна взаємодія у навчально-виховному процесі загальноосвітньої школи / В.В. Андрієвська, Г.О. Балл, А.Г. Волинець та ін. / [за ред. Г.О. Балла, О.В. Киричука, Р.М. Шамелашвілі]. – К. : УЗМН, 1997. – 136 с.