

Dialogue in Communicative Space of Education

Vera Lobastova^{1,*}, Tatyana Simonenko¹, and Oleg Samylov²

¹St. Petersburg state University, Institute of philosophy, 199034, Universitetskaya nab. 7/9, Russia

²St. Petersburg University of railway transport of Emperor Alexander I, faculty of Economics and management, 190031, Moskovsky Prospekt 9, Russia

Abstract. The authors of the article compare the classical and non-classical educational models in the context of the communication turn, actualized in the information society. Among the various types of integration processes, the most flexible and open form of interpersonal interaction is the dialogue. The hermeneutical concept of H.-G. Gadamer makes it possible to clarify the conditions necessary for conducting a constructive dialogue, and to show the possible convergence of the horizons of understanding through the construction of a single semantic continuum.

1 Introduction

One of the basic characteristics of the educational process is communication, which change its content and form during the processes of development of education and shift of educational paradigms. In the educational environment, communication largely determines the process of education, its success and effectiveness.

The classical model of education considers it as comprehension of disciplined information in the form of a certain system of knowledge, i.e. we are talking about a gradual, measured and planned assimilation of information. It gives rise to the need for their organization and accessible presentation. Signs of this approach to education are scientism (the immensely deepening specialization of students in individual scientific fields), monologue and authoritarianism in the teaching process that leads to the reduction of education primarily to learning. The educational model based on the identification of the person who knows as the educated person is static and is focused on disciplinary differentiation of knowledge in the form of relatively autonomous, closed information storage systems, which must be transferred in the learning process. Thus, the criterion of human education cultivated by this paradigm is the human's knowledge of the world and the ability to use this knowledge.

On the new, informational stage of the development of society, there are other goals and values of education. Among them, there may be the integration of various ways of cognition, which is implemented in the dynamics of interaction of different opinions, heuristic tasks, research programs, new complex educational technologies that connect different ways of thinking. At the same time, the object of cognition is not information at all, but methods of its absorption, and therefore the need for procedural acts of understanding and different forms of interpretation coexisting in the common space

of education is becoming increasingly important. In these conditions, the educational relation of a human and the world is multidimensional, voluminous and realized at different levels and in different planes.

The openness of the educational space is embodied primarily in its communicative nature, changing its vector of development from cultivating a proven before model of knowledge, behavior and thinking to a flexible and unbiased deployment of various methods of work of consciousness. The new approach leads to change in the orientation of the pedagogical relationship in the direction of actualizing the personal traits and abilities of the subject of education. A.O. Pustovarova argues on the need for a communicative turn in education that the non-classical paradigm, viewed in the light of communicativity, proceeds from the fact that the object of communication by definition cannot be initially described and is born in the process of communication itself. Because of this, the student sees the addressee in a pedagogical respect [1].

2 Problem statement

The development of a communicative culture in education presupposes the improvement of such form of the educational process as a dialogue. In the process of building a dialogue with the bearers of knowledge and culture (actual or mediated), both general and specialized knowledge enters the specific information field, through the comprehension of universal humanities problems, values and ideals into the universal aspects of culture and personal development. The topic of the dialogue and its significance in education have often been the subject of discussion in philosophy. For example, in the late 80s of the last century, the Soviet and Russian philosopher, culturologist and teacher V.S. Bibler in a series of lectures (commonly called "Dialogue of Cultures and the School of the 21st Century") suggested the concept of a

* Corresponding author: beshent@bk.ru

dialogue in education as a principle and a form of school education [2]. The theoretical position on the intrapersonal nature of the dialogue expressing its freedom, the ability to relate to the surrounding world (Other, culture, nature), to listen and to hear other things, to coexist and interact with the intellectual experience of the present and the past, was the most important conceptual idea.

Of course, dialogue is a deeply personal phenomenon, which determines the equivalence of the subjects of the dialogue, their active interaction with each other, their ability to be open to each other in this relationship, to overcome being-in-itself and being-for-itself, which, in fact, is the basis for personal self-development or self-education. At the same time, dialogue is not just a tool of the process of educational communication. This is neither a communication technique nor a set of certain techniques and rules. It is a practice, an attitude that transforms the subject himself. Thus, in the space of dialogue, the main tasks of education are solved.

3 Results and discussion

An attempt to understand dialogue as the basis of real development of the individual leads to the need to consider those intrasubject transformations that characterize the immanent field of dialogical experience. An interesting reflection on this topic is given by H.-G. Gadamer, who shows how the corresponding levels of the dialogical discourse "me-you" are being modeled in the process of interpersonal interactions of various types. These levels determine the nature and direction of the changes of the subjects themselves and build dialogical relations.

Initially, the understanding of the Other proceeds in an experience related to the formation of general knowledge. This level is superficial and is connected with the consideration of You exclusively in the field of preferences to the self, where you turns to the means for the self. In Aristotle's philosophy, one can find an explanation for this format of relationships, since according to Aristotle, the beginning of the experience is sensory perception, understood as the ability to clearly distinguish the individual. From sensory perception, the "ability to remember" arises due to retention of impression, which, upon repetition, becomes indivisible and general. Through the inductive method, the individual is cognized as the general. In the Posterior Analyst, Aristotle argues that "from a recurring memory of the same experience arises," and further: "... if one, not different from the other, is held, then the first general appears in the soul (for although the individual is perceived, but the perception is a perception of the general, for example a human, and not the person named Callia)" [3]. The positive result of experience consists in confirming the expectation, when the individual agrees with the general. Therefore, in the acts of perception and remembrance, the general acquires the stability of the conceptual form.

That is why the Other is initially realized as an object along with other objects of the transcendent world. The behavior of the Other is distinguished by typical moments, which make it possible to predict its actions. The naive belief in objectivity excludes the subjective side of the Other (or You in Gadamer's terminology), its personal layer of desires, interests, goals and objectives. Such an objectivistic understanding of the Other can only be used as a means to achieve its goals. This level of relationship testifies to the exclusively egoistic position of the subject, accompanied by a clear awareness of their own interests, as well as an understanding that dialogue is still necessary. In this sense, mutual interest and mutual attraction to each other arise, and thus necessary conditions for further interaction in the format of dialogue are created.

The next step in the development of a dialogical attitude is the recognition of You as a person. The personal level of understanding of the Other is realized through the realization of its uniqueness, "otherness". Due to the reflexive correlation with the self, the subjective side of the Other is taken into account. Here the dialogue between subjects becomes the place of a collision of claims. Each of the participants of the dialogue seeks to establish their own interests for the sake of achieving their goals. Claims on the significance of their beliefs emerge due to the prejudices of the previous experience, and the victory in the struggle for recognition goes to someone who can seize the initiative of the opposing entity, anticipating her personal claims. Because of such fierce competition, one participant in the dialogue claims its superiority over the other. Moreover, even concern of this participant, expressed in an educational attitude towards another, manifests itself as a reflexed form of will for domination [4].

The conflict character of interpersonal relations draws an attention of J.-P. Sartre. The essence of the conflict, according to Sartre, manifests itself in the fact that understanding the self as a subject does not coincide with understanding it by the Other. Under the sight of the Other, the self is ashamed of it, because the self does not know what kind of being can it be rewarded. In "Being and Nothingness" Sartre writes, "He produces my being and by means of it owns me, and this possession is nothing other than the consciousness of owning me". [5]. This kind of competition and opposition form the ability to see in the Other one who has the opportunity also to defend the Ego, to claim exclusivity and domination and to try to use various objects (natural, cultural, social) for own purposes. This gives rise to mutual interest in each of the parties to the dialog relationship. The discovery of an equal subject testifies, on the one hand, to the emerging ability of critical thinking of the personality and, on the other hand, about the awareness and acceptance of the need to show activity and make certain efforts to achieve the compatibility of understanding subjects in an intelligible space.

The art of dialogue, its versatility is determined by the level of personal qualities of each of the interlocutors. As A. Badiou notes: "love begins where politics ends" [6]. Both politics and love are strategies of

interaction, in which opposition and proximity of the participants in the dialogue are closely connected. For example, in political discourse the concern for one's personal interest remains, and its importance reaches enormous proportions and mobilizes all the forces to achieve the goal at all costs. On the contrary, in the discourse of love personal interest tends to be enriched by meeting with the interest of the other but acquires the illusion of reciprocity due to the shortness of this state, which inevitably perishes. Confirmation may be the idea of J.-P. Sartre, dedicated to the relationship of a loving and beloved: "In Love, the lover wants, on the contrary, to be all in the world for the beloved. It means that the lover puts himself next to the world; he concentrates in himself and symbolizes the whole world, he is this here, which embraces all other "these here", he is an object and agrees to be an object" [7].

The truly moral is the next step in the development of dialogue experience and self-determination of the individual, as it clearly shows that the relationships between people are not based on the search for universal knowledge. At this level, a deep and sustainable understanding of the dialogue participants is achieved through a strategy of "openness towards the Other", based on the understanding the Other is necessary for understanding oneself, and vice versa, understanding oneself depends on understanding the Other. "Mutual understanding, uniting the interlocutors, transforms them in such a way that they are no longer what they were before," – says H.-G. Gadamer [3].

What does this third kind of dialogue experience give? In the hermeneutic strategy of openness, the Other is given the opportunity to speak first. The dialogue recognizes the claim of the Other to be heard. H.-G. Gadamer points to a very important characteristic of this type of dialogue relationship: "... one who generally allows self to say something is in principle open" [3]. This means that the strategy of openness is based on the negative nature of the hermeneutic experience, and the negative nature of the experience of understanding is rather its advantage than a disadvantage.

After refuting false generalizations, the subject overcomes his delusions with the help of critical reflection. If subject realizes the finiteness and limitations of its immanence, it seeks to expand the horizon of his experience in obtaining a new understanding through questioning. In order to raise the question, it is important for the subject to realize his ignorance and to overcome the bias of the opinion, which, in the simplicity of its one-sidedness, seeks to spread as much as possible in experience in order to become familiar. However, the mechanical repetition of an opinion is not capable of lulling the vigilance of a subject's doubt. Moreover, H.-G. Gadamer does not exclude the possibility of a false statement of the question, which will create only the appearance of the openness of experience and readiness for renewal. False assumptions of the question most often conceal the variability of the expected answers, thereby indicating that the subject is still in the power of his opinion and cannot refuse it.

The hermeneutic horizon is the horizon of the question. It is precisely the "knowledge of ignorance" that awakens in the subject the necessity of posing a question that, following the desire to know, sketches out the possible perspective of the expected answer. The answer to the question paves the path to knowledge. An open question allows the possibility of both affirmative and negative statements, opposing them to each other. In the process of understanding, knowledge raises the right judgment, while excluding judgment is wrong. The choice of knowledge is achieved through the elimination of counterarguments, which turned out to be untenable.

Dialogic discourse has the structure of the question and the answer. As an invitation to a dialogue, the question turns to the listener, counting on his attention. The question sets the intrigue of the expected reflection, putting forward a topic for conversation. Listening to the question, one participant watches the thought of the other, anticipating information that has not yet been said by the speaker. So the topic of the dialogue gradually clears up and, filled with details and nuances, becomes the pole of the "semantic continuum" that unites the interlocutors and involves them in a dialogue which evolve from the interaction of question-answer statements. In the process of dialogue, the listener strives to uncover, to explicate the adequate meaning of the statements of the speaker. Gradually, the horizons of understanding of the interlocutors converge and in their single semantic continuum, there is a common knowledge for the participants of the dialogue, which in its truth surpasses the relativity of subjective opinions.

In the space of continuous interaction of meanings, the interlocutors' views do not intersect with each other, but rather move together in the same direction, constituting the intersubjective world of objects. Its existence for dialogue participants becomes so obvious that I. N. Dukhan emphasizes their "tangible" presence: "The flesh is the mobile, permeated by the energies of being, side of the world, in which the world becomes visible, where things and the contemplator observe each other. Thus, we and the world interpenetrate each other" [8].

The exceptional importance of dialogue experience, which depends on the fact that in the dialogue genuine educational knowledge is born, which is the result of bringing an objective universal truth into the world of the subject. This process is nothing more than a cultural event. It cannot conduct outside of human's need for, deep personal contact, outside the openness of a different position, point of view, mutual respect, readiness to accept the new information. At this stage, antagonism is being overcome; there is formed the ability to not only speak but also listen - to be silent, to create the identity of goals and educational tasks, the mutual empathy of both sides of the dialogical relationship.

Conclusion

Dialogue is the most important principle of education. Its uniqueness lies in the spirit of freedom, the absence of coercion, in the union and mutual enrichment of

dissimilar existences. The problem is that the organizational forms of the traditional educational system which is mainly oriented towards obtaining and consolidating knowledge and on the accuracy of doctrinal attitudes (be it science or morality) are not aimed at maintaining and developing communication in the form of a dialogue. They have another goal, which is still significant – reproduction and translation of culture. Hence there is the need to solve one more important task of education which is the creation of new educational technologies that have a complex character that they should be able to connect different ways of thinking (abstract-logical and figuratively-intuitive, rational and irrational) in order to develop a network of perceptually-linguistic communications. This will respectively lead to expansion of a human's contacts with the surrounding world and the development of the intellectual, creative and moral potential of the individual in conditions of diverse communication and a constructive dialogue.

References

1. A.O. Pustovarova, N. of Tomsk Pol. Univ. **309 (8)**, 224 (2006)
2. V.S. Bibler (ed.), *School of dialogue of cultures: ideas, experience, problems*, (Kemerovo, 1993)
3. Aristotle, *The second analyst. Essays* **2**, 345-346, (Moscow, 1978)
4. H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and method: Fundamentals of philosophical hermeneutics*, 423, 445, 425, (Moscow, 1988)
5. J.-P. Sartre, *Being and nothingness: Experiences phenomenological ontology*, 380, (Moscow, 2004)
6. A. Badiou, *Philosophy and the Event*, 40-44 (New York: Polity, 2013).
7. J.-P. Sartre, *Primary attitude to another: love, language, masochism*, The problem of man in Western philosophy, 212 (Moscow, 1988)
8. I.N. Dukhan, *Ist.-filos. Ezheg.* **7**, 191 (Moscow, 2011) (