

# Conceptual Shifts in the Post-Non-Classical Philosophical Understanding of Dialogue: Developing Cultural-Educational Space

Olena TROITSKA<sup>1</sup>,  
Valentina SINELNIKOVA<sup>2</sup>,  
Vitalii MATSKO<sup>3</sup>,  
Liudmyla VOROTNIAK<sup>4</sup>,  
Olesia FEDOROVA<sup>5</sup>,  
Tetiana RADZYNIAK<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University, Melitopol, Ukraine, [troizka2015@ukr.net](mailto:troizka2015@ukr.net), <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4330-084x>

<sup>2</sup> Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine, [valentinasinelnikova@ukr.net](mailto:valentinasinelnikova@ukr.net), <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9488-270X>

<sup>3</sup> Khmelnytskyi Humanitarian-Pedagogical Academy, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, [macko.vitaliy@gmail.com](mailto:macko.vitaliy@gmail.com), <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5512-3743>

<sup>4</sup> Khmelnytsky Humanitarian Pedagogical Academy, Khmelnytsky, Ukraine, [LVorotniak@gmail.com](mailto:LVorotniak@gmail.com)

<sup>5</sup> Khmelnytsky Humanitarian-pedagogical academy, Khmelnytsky, Ukraine, [fedoroval2012@ukr.net](mailto:fedoroval2012@ukr.net), <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2300-6387>

<sup>6</sup> Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Chernivtsi, Ukraine, [t.radzyniak@gmail.com](mailto:t.radzyniak@gmail.com), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2188-2597>

**Abstract:** *In the scientific literature, there are accents that emphasize certain changes in the functioning of philosophy, which took place in connection with the establishment of the postulates of postmodernism as a new period in the development of culture, as a style of post non-classical scientific thinking, in fact, the content and hierarchy of values positions itself with a sophisticated departure from the classical and non-classical philosophical reflection.*

*Philosophical and educational understanding of the methodology of research of dialogue and tolerance testified to the relevance of their research in the development of the potential of today's multicultural education and its growth in the cultural and educational space. Dialogue, dialogics and tolerance are represented by the mechanisms of meaning-making, axiology and praxeology: dialogical cognition of the interpersonal, social-group, societal, planetary world provides a certain "breakthrough" in the worldview-value coordinate system, in external-internal control of growth efficiency and its spiritual dimension.*

*The axiological, ontological, educational-epistemological aspects of "fitting" a person into a new world context are precisely in the plane of philosophy, enriching the cultural fields of today's education through integration in goal-setting, content, organizational and managerial conditions for teaching and upbringing value ideals, principles, methods of holistic study of a person and those that are relevant today and provide Homo educandus with a meaning-making knowledge.*

**Keywords:** *post-nonclassical science, post-nonclassical methodology, postmodernist "departure", educational discourse, cultural and educational space, philosophical methodology, holistic study of man.*

**How to cite:** Troitska, O., Sinelnikova, V., Matsko, V., Vorotniak, L., Fedorova, O., & Radzyniak, T. (2022). Conceptual Shifts in the Post-Non-Classical Philosophical Understanding of Dialogue: Developing Cultural-Educational Space. *Postmodern Openings*, 13(1), 388-407. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.1/403>

## Introduction

From the moment of its origin, philosophy sought not only to comprehend man in certain realities, but also to form goals, ideals, ideas that determine the deployment in reality of thoughts, priorities and principles that serve as regulations, norms and rules of its behavior. The cardinal questions of philosophical reflection at all times and in all nations were connected with the problem of education as a way and result of human culture.

A special place in the movement to culture belongs to science and education, but only if they are realized through meaning-making, which is determined by two elements - the socio-cultural context and human awareness of their place in the world. These elements outline the system requirements for the formation of cultural and educational institutions, regulate the activities of the educational process, determine the priorities of its development, ideals, values and goals of knowledge transfer about other cultures, their integration into life experience and thus form sociocultural synthesis and professional genesis.

The analysis of various scientific and educational practices actualizes the search for mechanisms of worldview and value of human entry into the universe of culture with minimal risks, which is the subject of many works of researchers, both domestic and foreign (Agazzi, 1991; Bondarevskaya, 2004). Thus, the Ukrainian philosopher Proleev (2014, p. 21), considering the "knowledge society" as a special situation of human existence and self-determination, revealing, in particular, the transformation of personality autonomy in the form of a transition from self to singularity, defines mobility as the main task of education, and dialogue, in our opinion, is precisely the way to implement new tasks (Nerubasska, et al., 2020; Nerubasska & Maksymchuk, 2020).

It is known that axiological, ontological, educational and epistemological aspects of "fitting" a person into a new world context are in the space of philosophy, in particular, in its methodological component. Therefore the analysis of the philosophical and methodological bases of the address of a science to value ideals and principles which are relevant to the present and provide the person with meaning-making knowledge, seems to us expedient.

In the scientific literature, there are accents that emphasize certain changes in the functioning of philosophy, which took place in connection with the establishment of the postulates of postmodernism as a new period in the development of culture, as a style of post nonclassical scientific

thinking, in fact, the content and hierarchy of values positions itself with a sophisticated departure from the classical and non-classical philosophical reflection.

At the same time, scientists in various fields of knowledge, analyzing the contextual changes of science at certain stages and directions of its development (Ricoeur, 1991), emphasize that in the realities of science methodological foundations do not "work" fully in an updated volume. All of the above applies to the consideration of dialogue and dialogics, in particular in the field of education today.

In addition, recognizing the fact that the autonomous block of the foundations of science is precisely the philosophical ideas and principles that substantiate the ideals and norms, the ontological postulates of science and ensure the entry of scientific knowledge into culture, we are forced to admit that, along with the function of substantiating already acquired knowledge, they perform a heuristic function, therefore it is impossible to imagine a fruitful organization of obtaining new knowledge without conceptual procedures of philosophy.

Note that the representatives of specific sciences, especially the natural sciences, distance themselves from philosophy, referring to the canons of rationality in the process of obtaining and translating truth, and point out the significant differences between philosophy and science. The same distancing is carried out by philosophers, rightly insisting that philosophy is associated with the creation of concepts based on immanent features, science - references; philosophy, as a "producer" of concepts, is not biased by certainty, it is characterized by the indivisibility and abundance of variations, and science must functionally consider only variables in deterministic circumstances; events serve as a statement of philosophical concepts, the state of affairs is the reference of scientific functions; philosophy and science are distinguished by the way of expressing their results.

Nowadays, education, in particular higher education, focusing on the process of becoming an innovative person, able to build relationships with the world based on their own discoveries and ways, as well as on the formation of individual readiness for a variety of practical activities, carries out in various areas of multicultural education personality-oriented learning and education and remains a universal way to preserve and develop culture, reproduction of spiritual and practical experience of generations in the personal world.

The future professional who acquires professional education must be ready to enter the interdependent world, which is formed as a single space of

rapprochement of one culture to another, as the integration of cultures while preserving identities and their spiritual enrichment with knowledge, skills, cultural communication skills. Dialogue as a search for the meanings of life and understanding becomes in such education the most important mechanism for implementing vital cultural and educational strategies.

Higher education institutions which should be a multicultural space through the dialogic parameter of educational and cognitive activity allow the activation of creative self-realization of students, their self-development, creating subject-subjective interaction of all participants of cultural and educational space, integrating activity of cultural and educational institutions and direct subjects - students, teachers, employees of educational institution, and also representatives of the state, political, cultural and educational organizations and movements that are engaged in cultural creation and to some extent influence the cultural and educational development of Homo educandus and ensure the development of a system of axiological orientations and thinking.

In various areas of higher education, the idea of dialogue is becoming rather common. Many teachers are interested in thought-provoking cultural and educational practices, and active methods of education dialogization.

However, in our opinion, most of the existing cultural and educational practices, especially religious and educational, remain outside the dialogue, outside the use of dialogue in the educational process. Moreover, the dialogue's subjectivity lies outside the updates in education and "knowledge society". Thus, it is impossible to consider a full-fledged process of socialization and personal development of future professionals. The content of the postulate and aspirations of philosophers to the education of cultural man remains unchanged.

Indeed, the introduction into the cultural and educational space, namely into the dialogical interaction of cultural identities with their specific positions and interests, complicates the process of interaction by encounters with otherness. Until now, although to varying degrees, scientific, educational, and philosophical discourses have been quite common in higher education, and religious and everyday discourses only "fight" for their right to exist.

## **Educational Dialogue and Educational Discourse in the context of Western European Postmodernism**

As noted by Edwards & Usher (2002), postmodern social dialogue, in terms of a new paradigm of education and educational studies, emerged due to reconsidering a practical role of the leading postmodern ideas. Despite an “asystemic” nature of the postmodernism concept, it not only deconstructs the classical systems of culture, society and education but also acts as a new methodological tool for understanding and reforming the post-war society and all forms of its consciousness. Thus, one can talk about postmodern art, education, psychology; yet, one cannot do it briefly and systematically.

Postmodern discourse is not a clear method for a philosophical review of all the aspects of social and personal life. It is only a way of reflection, an approach and an antipode to structured and rationalized traditional approaches (Zeeman et al., 2002). Its main strength lies in the use of one’s multimodal experience in the interaction with the world and culture, its artefacts and patterns. Therefore, this is primarily an irrational alternative that might lead to certain changes in worldview and world development.

It may seem that modernism, due to innovation and positivism, solved the basic issues of the philosophy of education. However, the flourishing of the post-non-classical dialogue on education in the 1980s and 1990s did not so much solve as raise some key issues for educators, sociologists and philosophers. These issues can be illustrated by the “role – form – purpose” triangle. Moreover, the greatest contradictions are found between a) rationalist guidelines of classical education – irrational reflexive and intuitive guidelines of post-modernism; b) the dominant concepts of traditional education – the marginalized and national new educational concepts. Beyer & Liston (1992) claim that a postmodern approach in its extreme manifestation can deprive education and even society of such important aspects as responsibility and morality. At the same time, the undeniable advantages of postmodern educational dialogue include the joint agreement of the parties on the personal involvement of participants in the educational process and its transformation within the limits allowed by educational goals.

Thus, the innovative and developmental power of postmodernism, not surprisingly, lies in its destabilizing, marginalizing and humanizing potential (Constas, 1998). In this regard, dialogue is organized by the vast educational community by ignoring the hierarchies and considering the great number of requests. Although it makes active discourse somewhat chaotic, it

also takes into account and exposes many aspects previously neglected or unknown.

It can be argued that the educational dialogue of postmodernism is “a dialogue between differences”. Burbules & Rice (1991) believe that there are two clear trends in “postmodern thought”: rethinking and reforming educational achievements of modernism and dismantling them completely. The first trend seems more promising, given that education (unlike art) cannot abandon the accumulated experience, which serves as its core.

Despite being multimodal, postmodern educational dialogue is unequivocally “soft” and pacifist, denying any directive from above. In this regard, a variety of educational approaches “celebrates the new fashion” (Gur-Ze-av, 2001, p. 315). Interestingly, peace must be considered rather broadly: as the absence of coercion and the presence of personal sovereignty. However, the presence of peace as an invariant value does not solve all contradictions in today’s education, so it is better to speak about the peaceful coexistence of different educational practices, which must compete for self-affirmation and consider the dialectical potential of contradictions.

Bioland (1995) highlights the contribution of the most influential postmodern philosophers to a new paradigm of higher education and singles out some discussion topics relevant to postmodern educational discourse. They are as follows: social conservatism, rigid postmodernism, the project of unrealized modernism, feminist perspectives, Marxist and post-Marxist historicism, postcolonialism, postmodernism and chaos theory, border pedagogy, and a liberal, pragmatic approach (Bioland, 1995). Even a superficial semantic and methodological analysis of these controversial issues allows one to shape such basic methodological concepts as “reaction to the previous”, “movement from structure to pluralism” (in the extreme – to chaos), “elimination of borders” and “liberalization”.

One should also pay particular attention to the links between postmodern dialogue and 21<sup>st</sup>-century education. The latter has already gone beyond all “post-”. Andreotti (2009) states that both epistemological pluralism and method of questioning episteme are important tools of educational discourse which are in line in their conceptualization of knowledge, learning, reality and identities as socially constructed, open to negotiation and always previous, as well as in the call for epistemological deviations from monoepistemism. However, the 21<sup>st</sup> century brings new social “tensions”, educational theories and practices which still remain within epistemological pluralism and can be assessed by postmodern deconstructionist methods.

Even though postmodernists recognize reflection and subsequent dialogicity as a key concept of research on humanities, the issues of validity, temporal dimension and epistemological breadth of dialogue remain open. One of the main issues is whether dialogue is important outside the measurement of time, or whether it is appropriate only when solving dilemmas. Cissna & Anderson (1998) claim that dialogue as a source of knowledge can also emerge in unequal relations between the subjects under the conditions of sufficient “intellectual climate”. At the same time, the cultural state of postmodernism acts as an environment that allows the participants in the dialogue to be equal, even when they demonstrate different methodological positions.

It must be noted that postmodernism was the first to raise the issue of words and language, as well as the verification of knowledge with their help. For the first time, philosophers questioned the objectivity and adequacy of the knowledge presented in the author’s linguistic discourse. This led to a broader formulation of the issue of linguistic and creative thinking in the context of dialogue between cultures in the postmodern era (Bokova & Milovannova, 2020). The issue of classical theoretical achievements in education was questioned not only because of dubious verification but also because of the new conditions of time, society and educational activity itself. It is still common to think that “a word is a universal scheme for fixing and storing information when it is “linked” to the image-representation” (Bokova & Milovannova, 2020, p. 47). So far, there are no options: the word is the only and universal tool for fixing and storing information. In the context of postmodernism, however, it makes sense in terms of linguistics, being in a living polylogic discourse, when this discourse is alive and interdisciplinary.

Thus, postmodern deconstruction, pluralism and doubts about traditional values have led to a total revision of all humanitarian forms of social consciousness, including education. Besides, values and methodological basics, as well as the very “heart” of human knowledge (word, dialogue and discourse), have been deconstructed.

### **Educational discourse within the cultural and educational space**

Moreover, when discourse is viewed as an oral or writing form of consciousness objectification, it is always regulated by sociocultural codes (rules, values, ethos) of a certain social practice (education, science, law, medicine, politics, economics, religion, etc.) and cannot be such.

Thus, the representatives of scientific discourse are obliged to "remove" ideological and worldview contradictions and to proliferate the

principles of cognition, reflectivity and objectivity, to ensure a high logical culture, as well as scientific and historical, deideologization and deliberalization, emotional and psychological support, etc.

In this sense, it is impossible to ignore the tradition of philosophical discourse in dialogue, which has a rich history and which all the time differed from all discourses in its fundamental pluralism, polyphony, a variety of epistemological, ontological, methodological, value-semantic concepts, retain definitive correctness, transparency, logical consistency and semantic meaning. The most general concepts of a particular field of knowledge or science serve to reduce the experience of finding objective relations, dismemberment and synthesis of reality... and universals, which include existing, one, true, good". It should be added that religious, in particular theological discourse, occupies a specific place, because it was formed within philosophy, or next to it.

Emphasis should also be placed on the functional purpose of dialogue, namely on its definition as a goal-ideal (consciously chosen image of the intended result) and as a mechanism for transforming the world around us, which endlessly creates new goals (goal-setting). In this sense, it becomes necessary to turn to the founders of the dialogue - Socrates and his followers, who launched a dialogue with its high degree of perfection based on clarifying the essence of a concept using questions and answers, in which the main thing was not knowledge as such, but wisdom as an image life, as its sense (how to live, by which concepts).

### **The role of philosophical methodology in ensuring the holistic study of man**

Philosophy has already traveled the path of these universals ... ". The main idea of Deleuze & Guattari (2013) is represented by the expression: "We are responsible not for the victims, but we are responsible vis-a-vis victims."

Regarding the most important "product" of philosophy - conceptualization, which as a way of understanding the world, in our opinion, first, is closer to man, his ideas and plans. This aspect is thoroughly covered in the works of Agazzi (1991), Foucault (1994) and other researchers, who point to the advantages of a philosophical style of thinking that takes into account all visible and invisible (phenomenologically obvious) influences on human perception of the world: "Even when it comes to a person, this distribution can be reflected in the statement that the human body belongs to nature (res extensa - the sphere of competence of science),



and therefore can be considered as a mechanism, while the “ real person ” remains in the field philosophy. Therefore, when it is noted that philosophy discovered the subjects, it can be understood as a consequence of the fact that philosophy gave science the knowledge of nature, but retained the knowledge of man.

Thus, from these understandings allegedly follows a certain division of scientific subjectivity in dialogue, which immediately passes into the plane of the humanities, from the field of dialogue disappears the problematic situation of man, which may relate to his attitude to nature, technology, etc. Therefore, we believe that post-nonclassical philosophy "returns" the dialogue to a person who lives in all spheres.

Paradigmatic changes also occur in the renewal of the foundations of science, which, being heterogeneous, nevertheless presuppose variations in philosophical ideas and categorical meanings, use them in research activities, due to which scientific knowledge begins to be considered in the context of social conditions is determined at each stage of development by the general state of culture corresponding historical era, its value orientations and ideological attitudes. In addition, the philosophical understanding of the historical variability of not only ontological postulates, but also the actual ideals and norms of cognition allows research to include ideas, concepts and norms in their general scientific worldview.

It is also impossible to overestimate the role of philosophical methodology in ensuring the holistic study of man. Specific, even humanitarian, sciences study a person "aspectally", and not as an whole being. They are not aimed at considering all aspects of human development and culture: each specific knowledge, realized as scientific knowledge within its subject and thesaurus, generates a partial idea of man. Metatheoretical methodological reflection of different types of cognitive activity, achievements of different sciences that study man is required. This approach will contribute to the explication of the ontological and semantic foundations of the phenomenon, to identify ways and means of integrating philosophical principles into human research. In addition, the comprehension of values will be directed towards the higher (universal) meanings of being only in the plane of philosophy (Troitska, 2015).

The philosophical level of methodology, which contributes to the discovery of new knowledge needed by people today, provides understanding of significant changes in the process of obtaining the truth, which is influenced by many factors and this understanding becomes plural-procedural and dialogical. It should be noted that the traditional theory of cognition was "engaged" in the concept of "truth", which was

unambiguously interpreted mainly in the cognitive aspect. The postmodern model perceives the truth largely socially and operationally, i.e. as a set of rules according to which the "real" is separated from the false on the basis of argument: truth is produced in the world itself, belongs to it, and affects, connotations affect the truth or as separate indirect modes, superimposed on the direct meaning of the word (for example, the negative meaning of the "human factor"), or as genre conventions that affect the constitution of other meanings ("flame" in the literature - love), or as stereotypes of perception, stylistic features, etc.

A special place in these superstructures and the search for true meanings is occupied by the phenomenon of marginality - (from Latin "margo" - edge, border) - a concept used in the cultural tradition to denote borderline (often antisocial or antisocial) spiritual phenomena and intellectual strategies that develop beyond that type rationality, which dominates at one time or another in the cultural tradition. All this should be taken into account when analyzing the real practices of dialogue, in which "boundary and non-boundary" meanings and meanings interact and argue.

That is why, for all the variety of currents of postmodernism, its main representatives (Rorty, 1996; Foucault, 1994), according to the compilers of the philosophical encyclopedic dictionary, are unanimous in understanding the fundamental assessments of truth:

- people do not have direct access to reality, so there are no adequate means of understanding the truth in principle;
- reality is unattainable, because people are "captives" of language, which sets the form of thought;
- reality is constructed by people with the help of language, and therefore its nature is determined by those who have the right to form it (Gritsanov, 2007, p. 426).

Such a "stain" of truth and reality by human subjectivity also requires the use of dialogue as a special philosophical methodology for finding the true meanings of existence in the multifacetedness of its conceptual interpretations and understandings.

Finally, dialogical philosophical methodology is able, on the one hand, to produce an explicit typology of values, implicitly set standards of perfection, and, on the other hand, to introduce them into human science and self-esteem in order to target human obligations and such ethical a component of moral duty that presupposes morality even in a conflicting structure of action or interaction.

It is known that each action is an interaction and is structurally dialogical and asymmetric. According to Ricoeur (1991), this is due to the

fact that where ... .. “where there is power, there is the possibility of violence” (pp. 57–59). If the first opens the way to the ethics of virtues, then the second to the ethics of duty, the essence of which lies, in my opinion, in one of the recent formulations of the categorical imperative: “Treat the human principle in yourself and in another person not only as a means, but also as self-sufficient value”. I emphasize that, in my opinion, it is not desire but violence that forces us to give morality the character of an obligation ... It is impossible to do in science, it is transcendent” (Ricoeur, 1991, pp. 57–59).

In the scientific and educational tradition, the prevailing view is that the methodological function of philosophy, the philosophical component of methodology on these settings and ends. The ideal of classical and non-classical rationality was science free from values. Therefore, the value-ethical regulators of scientific knowledge were not previously needed to improve scientific tools, on the one hand, and on the other - the attribution of axiological functions only to philosophy, as we see, barely influenced the acquisition of new knowledge and ways of its translation. Integration of values into the framework of science is inherent in post nonclassical rationality. In post nonclassical science, in our opinion, philosophical principles have "work" from the very beginning of research and long before the first results are obtained.

In this sense, it should be noted: even the assumption that the dialogue can take place outside the plane of values and value orientations will immediately change the system of choice of methods, techniques, technologies of the research and scientific-educational process of dialogization, especially in the implementation of the teleological function, in that it part, which is related to the methodology of the implementation of the idea of dialogue and dialogics in scientific and educational transformations.

Thus, the entry of science into a new paradigmatic synthesis, the introduction of value-emotional components will make possible project scenarios of human search for the "powerful inner strength" that develops within the historical, traditional "dimensions" and various challenges of time and space. The prototype of the methodology of such scenarios can be the philosophy of education, which, as a branch of philosophical knowledge, can "remove" limitations in human cognition, as it organically combines in its subject area analysis of the process of obtaining knowledge about man and the process of translation, assimilation and use.

At the same time, according to the correct observation of Samchuk (2005, pp. 98–99), the key question for a person is "WHY? " ... balanced - conceptually, axiologically, ideologically-theoretically, deontologically - the answer can only be given by philosophy, because the answer of pedagogy or any other scientific discipline will always be marked as, say, "professional provincialism". After all, there is nothing offensive in the statement of provincialism, because it always depends on the province whether we will have bread, and if so, whether there will be something in addition to bread. This metaphor, of course, extends to the scientific field. In this case, we are talking about the inadmissibility of relying on scientific provincialism mission to determine the conceptual foundations of transformation.

It is no coincidence that Kiyashchenko & Moiseev (2009, p. 9), revealing the causes and essence of transdisciplinary landslides, substantiate the need for philosophical transdisciplinarity, which "... makes consideration of the main trends in the formation of the methodology and ethos of postnonclassical science, which explicate the fundamental features of cognitive relations that form a person and his world in a holistic integral view". Therefore, Gomilko (2014), analyzing the universal dialogue, proposes to put transdisciplinarity in the basis of "methodology of dialogue and in the perspective of the development of science..." (p. 33).

Indeed, the knowledge of dialogue and dialogization will be associated with the recognition of reality, the legitimacy and the need for coexistence and interaction of people who perceive and cognize reality in different ways, in different disciplinary languages, at different levels of intellectual correctness and ethics, interpret certain contradictions in meetings of values and identities.

Changes in post-nonclassical science have posed to humanities, which studies dialogue and dialogics, two fundamental tasks: the first - to combine the huge, accumulated over the centuries, experimental material into a single theory that will understand human behavior in interaction with others, and the second - to implement in scientific ideas about the world the concepts of innovative, full-fledged, dialogical human development. These tasks should rely on a newly developed methodology not only the acquisition of new knowledge, but also the construction of new (own) assessments of projects, mechanisms for organizing life in a multicultural world.

A prominent place in this process belongs to the natural property of man - his dialogics as the ability to comprehend in the pluralism of opinions the mysteries of the world and to rebuild it on the basis of objectively determined laws and moral and ethical principles. In addition, dialogics

makes it possible to master the general civilizational rules of interaction of the presenters of different cultures, subcultures and countercultures.

It should be noted that the dialogic principle contributes to the establishment of a consensus relationship between opposites, so a person has the opportunity to overcome the boundaries of contradictions and enter into a wider range of possibilities for resolving them. In this sense, post-classical methodology, overcoming disciplinary, paradigmatic, cultural and other constraints of search, offers the principle of transgression to establish relevance. In the space "between" and "trans" the modality of thinking changes: it becomes probabilistic, (Gorbunova, 2007).

In this thinking, the development of dialogics, like other personality traits, arises as an assembly of hypostases, psychological characteristics (intellectual, social, spiritual-mental). At the same time, probabilistic interpretation becomes important not so much as the analysis of acts of dialogic interaction, but as the analysis of levels of development of the person on system (spherical) parameters of its self-improvement.

It is no coincidence that in a thorough study of the life competence of a person, Stepanenko & Stepanenko (2011, p. 85), defining the meta-anthropological dimension of life competence as the ability to create life, emphasize its consistency, integrativeness and note that "... life creation is not a separate area of human life, it is carried out naturally in all life contexts - family relationships, communication, especially with important people, in professional activities, in communication with nature, art, education, public and political activity, etc. ".

In our opinion, it seems appropriate to clarify the semantic components (structural elements) of personality development, among which we distinguish: worldview and value component as a motivational and semantic definition of man in relation to the world, to people, to himself; cultural and epistemological - knowledge and recognition of value mechanisms of development of own culture and other cultures; operational - definition of strategies and tactics of behavior and relationships with people, with "informal" interlocutors (God, the Court of Honor, etc.); analytical-effective or reflexive-evaluative - analysis of development results, development of schemes for monitoring this development and drawing up self-development programs. At each of these levels, dialogue, as a way of resolving or minimizing contradictions, should be the leading mechanism for ensuring constructive and effective action and life.

That is why the appeal of humanities to the problem of human dialogics is extremely important. In the best traditions of scientific analysis in the works of many philosophers revealed the role of dialogue, through

which *Homo scientis* (man of knowledge) will grow into *Homo sapientis* (man of wisdom). In the dialogue a person falls into the plane of interpretations of the vast experience of mankind. During the dialogic communication the secret of the "Other" is revealed for the person, which enriches the intersubjectivity of the personality, actualizes the coexistence of people (Lyakh & Pazenok, 1996).

In addition, through dialogue one of the most crucial mechanisms of the civilized arrangement of the life of a person is being worked out, namely, the implementation in practice of minimizing alienation in today's society, which often atomizes human existence, makes a person lonely and abandoned.

From the point of view of philosophical methodology, the post-nonclassical dimension of the study of the dialogics of a person is of interest, which is objectified in dialogical interaction and is directly related to the value-worldview positions of a person. This requires scientific analysis, namely, the refusal of researchers from the continuous reduction of dialogicity and the possibility of its reduction or to certain acts of communication, or to certain views of the individual regarding dialogic attributes, etc. It is the metaphysical view of the essence of things that is the way to "preserve" the integrity of *Homo sapiens*, in particular *Homo dialogicus*.

Taking into account contextual changes in the study of dialogue requires a thorough analysis of its varieties, primarily because in reality different formulations of the same phenomenon are used and, conversely, various essential objects and phenomena are identified (multicultural dialogue, intercultural dialogue, dialogization of space, multicultural education, discourse, etc.).

The most important problem of science, as mentioned above, is the discovery of new knowledge that can form a person's stable landmarks and meanings for the realization of a person's versatile cultural interests and values, as well as substantiation of ways of full-fledged, comprehensive, harmonious improvement of a person and his life.

Thanks to the new methodologies of post-non-classical science, it becomes possible to consider dialogue as a subject of problem-oriented (interdisciplinary) research, and the analysis of dialogicity and the immanent nature of dialogue is shifted to the human life world. In this way the potential of lateral thinking, conceptualization, contextuality, metaphysicality and sophistry unfolds.

Today, perhaps more than ever, it is extremely important to talk about the need for dialogue, which is a way to spiritually enrich its

participants. It is no coincidence that Malakhov (2006) notes: "The present century is often said to be a century of dialogue. I will add: in order not to become the beginning of an era of great silence" (p. 3). The world famous founders of the philosophy of dialogue (Buber, 1995) have revealed its significant possibilities in a person's awareness of the objective value of his "Ego", in understanding its originality, in discovering a new quality of functioning and predicting development. They proved that dialogue increases the amount of values that are perceived in one way or another and modify the nature of attitudes to life. Thus, thanks to the dialogue, the perception of life becomes pluralistic, far-sighted and able to prevent the degradation of culture, its isolation, etc.

In addition, dialogue as a way of cultural communication, as insisted by the representatives of radical pedagogy (Freire, 2003), provides not only the priority of a person who interacts with others to improve their own lives, but also promotes deeper and consensual understanding the priority of man for education in general. According to the fair observation of Uvarkina (2013): "The development of the national education system of Ukraine, in which this priority has always been and will always provide an opportunity to fully identify the potential of the Ukrainian people, as well as bring the level of education to the content and methodological levels inherent in the European educational space" (p. 23). In our opinion, preserving the best systemic human components of national education is an extremely important task.

Thus, significant changes in the canons of science associated with the postmodern "departure" from the classical and non-classical tradition of worldview. Particular attention is paid to the metatheoretical role of philosophical methodology as a value-ethical regulator of scientific knowledge, as a norm for selecting and improving the tools of scientific research and as a set of leading ideas for obtaining, translating and using the results of dialogue and dialogics.

Dialogics in this context acts as a project for the identification of that inner power in a person that develops within the framework of historical, traditional and non-traditional conditions and challenges of time and space, in which the globalization information factor of development significantly affects the dialogics of a person and her life and society. That is why the ability of man to direct his life to comply with the laws of nature is quite justified, scientists move society into the subject plane of philosophical management of information and educational processes (Yaroshenko, 2009; Kyvlyuk, 2014).

Recognition of the need to strengthen the methodological tools for finding new knowledge by philosophical and worldview, in particular axiological and spiritual-practical principles, constitutes the quintessence of the investigated issues and determines new methodological guidelines for post-nonclassical scientific research. Since the main integrator of efforts for multicultural activity is multicultural education, including the above, its focus on the search for culturally and nature-appropriate ways of developing a personality's culture deserves considerable attention.

At the same time, fruitful dialogization of the goal, content and organizational and managerial conditions of higher education requires not only the involvement of philosophical, pedagogical, social and humanitarian theories and the development of technologies for constructive interaction, dialogue and tolerance as constructs of consensual ethics in this process, but also the joining of efforts of all subjects of the cultural and educational environment with the prospect of its transformation into a cultural continuum.

## **Conclusions**

Philosophical and educational understanding of the methodology of research of dialogue and tolerance testified to the relevance of their research in the development of the potential of multicultural education and its growth in the cultural and educational space. Dialogue, dialogics and tolerance are represented by the mechanisms of meaning-making, axiology and praxeology: dialogical cognition of the interpersonal, social-group, societal, planetary world provides a certain "breakthrough" in the worldview-value system of coordinates, in the external-internal control of the effectiveness of growth and its spiritual dimension.

The axiological, ontological, educational-epistemological aspects of "fitting" a person into a new world context are precisely in the plane of philosophy, enriching the cultural fields of education through integration in goal-setting, content, organizational and managerial conditions for teaching and upbringing value ideals, principles, methods of holistic study of a person and those that are relevant today and provide Homo educandus with a meaning-making knowledge.

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors are truly grateful to library staff and administrators of websites with multiple databases on many different academic disciplines for access to relevant sources. In particular, Liudmyla Vorotniak collected



theoretical data on postmodern views regarding the research problem. Tetiana Radzinyak and Vitalii Matsko analyzed current scientific and educational practices. Olesia Fedorova justified the philosophical-educational understanding of methods for studying dialogue and tolerance. Olena Troitska considered the current anthropological aspects of the philosophy of education. Valentina Sinelnikova performed the final editing of the article.

---

## References

---

- Agazzi, E. (1991). Chelovek kak predmet filosofskogo poznaniya [Man as a subject of philosophical knowledge]. In I. T. Frolov (Ed.), *O chelovecheskom v cheloveka* [About human in a human] (pp. 59-80). Politizdat.  
<http://lib.mgppu.ru/OpacUnicode/app/webroot/index.php?url=/notices/index/IdNotice:158592/Source:default>
- Andreotti, V. (2009). Global education in the “21st century”: Two different perspectives on the “post-“of postmodernism. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 2(2), 5-22.  
[https://www.scienceopen.com/document\\_file/a1edd56e-b373-49a7-b0c6-c0b39ac7d140/ScienceOpen/s2.pdf](https://www.scienceopen.com/document_file/a1edd56e-b373-49a7-b0c6-c0b39ac7d140/ScienceOpen/s2.pdf)
- Beyer, L.E., & Liston, D.P. (1992). Discourse or moral action? A critique of postmodernism. *Educational Theory*, 42(4), 371-393.  
[https://www.colorado.edu/education/sites/default/files/attached-files/Beyer\\_Liston\\_Discourse\\_or\\_Moral\\_Action.pdf](https://www.colorado.edu/education/sites/default/files/attached-files/Beyer_Liston_Discourse_or_Moral_Action.pdf)
- Bioland, H.G. (1995). Postmodernism and higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(5), 521-559. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2943935>
- Bokova, T.N., & Milovannova, L.A. (2020). Linguo-creative thinking in the context of dialogue of cultures in the postmodern era. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 95, 47-53. [https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs\(2357-1330\).2020.11.3](https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs(2357-1330).2020.11.3)
- Bondarevskaya, E.V. (2004). *Kulturno-obrazovatelnoye prostranstvo vuza kak sreda professionalno-lichnostnogo samorazvitiya studenta* [Cultural and educational space of the university as an environment for the professional and personal self-development of a student]: [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Rostov State Pedagogical University. <http://nauka-pedagogika.com/pedagogika-13-00-08/dissertaciya-kulturno-obrazovatelnoe-prostranstvo-vuza-kak-sreda-professionalno-lichnostnogo-samorazvitiya-studentov>
- Buber, M. (1995). *Dva obraza very* [Two images of faith]. Respublika.  
[https://royallib.com/book/martin\\_buber/dva\\_obraza\\_veri\\_sbornik\\_rabot.html](https://royallib.com/book/martin_buber/dva_obraza_veri_sbornik_rabot.html)
- Burbules, N., & Rice, S. (1991). Dialogue across differences: Continuing the conversation. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(4), 393-417.  
<https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.61.4.yr0404360n31j418>

- Cissna, K.N., & Anderson, R. (1998). Theorizing about dialogic moments: The Buber-Rogers position and postmodern themes. *Communication Theory*, 8(1), 63-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1998.tb00211.x>
- Constas, M.A. (1998). Research news and comment: The changing nature of educational research and a critique of postmodernism. *Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 26-33. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X027002026>
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2013). *Chto takoye filosofiya?* [What is philosophy? The Institute of Experimental Sociology. <https://www.yakaboo.ua/chto-takoe-filosofija-63.html#tab-attributes>
- Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (2002). *Postmodernism and education: Different voices, different worlds*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203425206>
- Foucault, M. (1994). *Slova i veshchi: Arheologiya gumanitarnykh nauk* [Words and things: Archeology of the humanities]. Academia. [https://platon.net/load/knigi\\_po\\_filosofii/kulturologija/fuko\\_m\\_slova\\_i\\_veshhi\\_arkheologiya\\_gumanitarnykh\\_nauk\\_1994/16-1-0-1615](https://platon.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/kulturologija/fuko_m_slova_i_veshhi_arkheologiya_gumanitarnykh_nauk_1994/16-1-0-1615)
- Freire, P. (2003). *Pedagogika prybnoblenykh* [Pedagogy of the oppressed]. Universe. <https://nashformat.ua/products/pedagogika-prybnoblenykh-700890>
- Gomilko, O. (2014). Pro universalnyy dialoh (Desyatyy svitovyy konhres ISUD “Lyudska istota: yiy pryroda ta funktsiyi”, 4-9 lypnya 2014 roku, Krayova, Rumuniya) [On universal dialogue ((Tenth ISUD World Congress “Human Being: Its Nature and Functions”, July 4-9, 2014, Craiova, Romania)]. *Filosofiya osvity*, 1(14), 25-34. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/PhilEdu\\_2014\\_1\\_4](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/PhilEdu_2014_1_4)
- Gorbunova, L.S. (2007). Skladne myslennya yak vidpovid na vyklyk epokhy [Complex thinking as a response to the challenge of the era]. *Filosofiya osvity*, 1(6), 40-55. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/skladne-mislennya-yak-vidpovid-na-viklik-epohi/viewer>
- Gritsanov, A.A. (2007). *Noveyshiy filosofskiy slovar. Postmodernizm* [The newest philosophical dictionary. Postmodernism]. Sovremenny literator. [https://platon.net/load/knigi\\_po\\_filosofii/postmodernizm/gricanov\\_a\\_a\\_noveyshij\\_filosofskij\\_slovar\\_postmodernizm/54-1-0-597](https://platon.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/postmodernizm/gricanov_a_a_noveyshij_filosofskij_slovar_postmodernizm/54-1-0-597)
- Gur-Ze-ev, I. (2001). Philosophy of peace education in a postmodern era. *Educational Theory*, 51(3), 315-336. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2001.00315.x>
- Kiyashchenko, L.P., & Moiseev, V.I. (2009). *Filosofiya transdistsiplinarnosti* [Philosophy of transdisciplinarity]. The Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences. <https://iphras.ru/uplfile/root/biblio/2009/Kiyashenko.pdf>
- Kyvlyuk, O.P. (2014). Hlobalizatsiya ta informatyzatsiya osvity v predmetnomu poli filosofiyi osvity [Globalization and informatization of education in the subject field of philosophy of education]. *Humanitarnyy visnyk Zaporizkoyi derzhavnoyi inzhenernoyi akademiyi* [Humanitarian Bulletin of Zaporozhia State

- Engineering Academy], 57, 192-200.  
[http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/znpvgvzdia\\_2014\\_57\\_19](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/znpvgvzdia_2014_57_19)
- Lyakh, V.V., & Pazenok, V.S. (1996). *Suchasna zarubizhna filozofiya. Techii i napryamy* [Foreign philosophy today. Flows and directions]. Vakler.  
[https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Liakh\\_Vitalii/Suchasna\\_zarubizhna\\_filozofia\\_Techii\\_i\\_napriamky\\_Khrestomatia/](https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Liakh_Vitalii/Suchasna_zarubizhna_filozofia_Techii_i_napriamky_Khrestomatia/)
- Malakhov, V.A. (2006). *Etyka spilkuvannya* [Ethics of communication]. Lybid.  
<http://library.nung.edu.ua/etyka-spiilkuvannya.html>
- Nerubasska, A., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). The demarcation of creativity, talent and genius in humans: A systemic aspect. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(2), 240-255. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.2/172>
- Nerubasska, A., Palshkov, K., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). A systemic philosophical analysis of the contemporary society and the human: new potential. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(4), 275-292.  
<https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.4/235>
- Prolev, S. (2014). "Suspilstvo znan" yak antropolohichna sytuatsiya ["Knowledge society" as an anthropological situation]. *Filozofiya osvity*, 1(14), 7-24.  
[http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/PhilEdu\\_2014\\_1\\_3](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/PhilEdu_2014_1_3)
- Ricoeur, P. (1991). Kakogo roda vyskazyvaniya o cheloveke mogu prepdosit filozofy [What kind of statements about a person can philosophers present]. In I. T. Frolov (Ed.), *O chelovecheskom v cheloveka* [About human in a human] (pp. 40-59). Politizdat.  
<https://www.livelib.ru/work/1001423669/reviews-kakogo-roda-vyskazyvaniya-o-cheloveke-mogut-prinadlezhat-filozofam-pol-rikjor>
- Rorty, R. (1996). *Sluchaynost, ironiya i solidarnost* [Accident, satire and solidarity]. Russian phenomenological society.  
[https://platon.net/load/knigi\\_po\\_filozofii/postmodernizm/rorti-sluchajnost-ironiya-solidarnost](https://platon.net/load/knigi_po_filozofii/postmodernizm/rorti-sluchajnost-ironiya-solidarnost)
- Samchuk, Z.F. (2005). Svitohlyadni azymuty osvithoyi navihatsiyi v umovakh suchasnoho suspilnoho prostoru Ukrainy [Worldview azimuths of educational navigation in the conditions of today's social space of Ukraine]. *Filozofiya osvity*, 2, 95-109.  
<http://enpuir.npu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/2431>
- Stepanenko, I.V., & Stepanenko, M.D. (2011). *Zhyttyeva kompetentnist osobystosti: filozofsko-antropolohichnyy ta sotsiokul'turnyy vymiry* [Life competence of personality: philosophical-anthropological and sociocultural dimensions]. Kharkiv State University of Nutrition and Trade. [http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis\\_nbuv/cgiirbis\\_64.exe?I21DBN=EC&P21DBN=EC&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=fullweb&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=I=&S21COLORTERMS=0&S21STR=BA743772](http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?I21DBN=EC&P21DBN=EC&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=fullweb&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=I=&S21COLORTERMS=0&S21STR=BA743772)

- Troitska, O.M. (2015). Conceptual foundations of dialogue idea implementation into cultural educational space. *Canadian Scientific Journal*, 1, 87–92.  
<http://csjournal.ca/conceptual-foundations-of-dialogue-idea-implementation-into-cultural-educational-space/>
- Uvarkina, O.V. (2013). Priorityet lyudyny yak kharakterna osoblyvist ukrayinskoyi natsionalnoyi systemy osvity: istoryko-filosofskyy kontekst [The priority of man as a characteristic feature of the Ukrainian national education system: historical and philosophical context]. *Versus*, 2, 23-28.  
[http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/vers\\_2013\\_2\\_6](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/vers_2013_2_6)
- Yaroshenko, A.O. (2009). *Potentsial i efektyvnist osvitho-informatsynoyi polityky* [Potential and efficiency of educational and information policy]. M. P. Drahomanov National Pedagogical University.  
<http://enpuir.npu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/567>
- Zeeman, L., Poggenpoel, M., Myburgh, C.P.H., & Van Der Linde, N. (2002). An introduction to a postmodern approach to educational research: Discourse analysis. *Education*, 123(1), 96-102.  
<https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA94265110&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=00131172&p=AONE&sw=w&userGroupName=anon%7E53fab9b8>