Intentional Dialogue as the Core of Pedagogical Technologies

Aleksandrov EVGENIY[1], Gritsenko VASILY[1], Danilchenko TATIANA[2], Vasilenko ELENA[3] and Babaeva TATIANA[4]

[1]Department of Pedagogics, Psychology and Philosophy, Krasnodar State Institute of Culture, Krasnodar Street 40-letya Pobedy, 33

[2]Department of Russian, Foreign Languages and Literature, Krasnodar State Institute of Culture, Krasnodar Street 40-letya Pobedy, 33

[3]Design and Applied Art, Moscow, Russian Federation, Moscow State University of Technology and Management named after K.G. Rasumovsky (the First Cossacs University), 73, Zemlyanoy val, Moscow, 109004

[4]Department of Humanities of Taganrog Institute of Management and Economics, Taganrog, Rostov Region, Petrovskaya Street, 45

Abstract. The modern addressing of a pedagogical discourse to the phenomenological and existential theory is explained by the aspiration to deepen understanding of pedagogical process and to receive results more essential, than by objectivistic consideration of pedagogical interaction. The main idea of the article consists in showing that the quality of process of training and cognition is caused by efficiency of understanding, existence of the developed ability of reflexive consciousness and intension on semantic dialogue. The last assumes presence at subjects of informative and educational communication of methodology and a technique of reflexive thinking. It provides a dominant of immanent development of knowledge, but not understanding of the result itself.

Intentional understanding of knowledge includes unity of thinking and experience. The intentionality of consciousnesses of the interacting subjects creates semantic focus for mutual understanding and dialogue. The problem of semantic focus arises because any process of communication is lacunae. It assumes distinction of personal semantic thesauruses of communicants.

These ideas developed in the works of representatives of the existential direction of philosophy and psychology (M. Heidegger, M. Merleau-Ponty, R. Ingarden, M. Buber, etc.) for which the intentionality is the dialogical relations in the essence in the systems "I am - Another", "I am - the Cultural Environment" and even "I am—I am (I am as Another)". Intentionally dialogue appears as a way of existence of consciousness, "a frontage to Another", "invocation to Another", at the same time,—"the response to call of Another" (M. Buber) mediates the general shape of the axiological guides of the personality as out of interface to Others the subject cannot create the attitude and towards himself. Existence of semantic dialogue and an intentionality is interdependent. The authors' aim is usage of intentional dialogue and technology of social theater for correction of deviant consciousness, for increase in social adaptation of orphans and children who were left without guardianship.

1. Introduction

A characteristic feature of modern pedagogical science is the desire to break out of the narrow utilitarian boundaries of research. J.F. Gerbart also noted that the goals of education are derived from philosophy [1]. V. Diltey pointed to pedagogy (in the broad sense of the word) as the ultimate goal of any "true philosophy," because it is philosophy that sets the value coordinates of human formation [2. P.7]. J. Dewey believed that philosophy in the most general sense was a theory of education [3]. In recent years, a notable part of pedagogical discourse has been addressed to phenomenal-existential theory,

through the prism of which the value bases of education, the essence of subjects of pedagogical interaction, pedagogical process, pedagogical interactions and pedagogical technologies are rethinking.

2. Materials and Method

The center of the phenomenology of F. Brentano and E. Gusserl is the concept of "intentionality." E. Gusserl called intentionality as a "meaning-giving phenomenon" through which the world and its objects are constituted by consciousness and function as "units of meaning". In the article for the "British Encyclopedia," the philosopher noted that the intentionality of the consciousness of interacting subjects, on the one hand, creates a sense focus for mutual understanding and dialogue and on the other lead to a cause of inevitable sense inconsistencies [4].

This idea developed in the works of the representatives of the existential direction of philosophy and psychology (M. Heidegger, M. Merlo-Ponti, R. Ingarden, M. Buber). Dialogue as a way of existence of consciousness, "turning to the Other," calling to the Other, "and at the same time -" response to the call of the Other "(M. Buber) mediates the general contour of understood coordinates of the person, because outside the interface with the Others the subject cannot form an attitude to itself as well. At the same time, I and You, although they exist for each other, do not merge completely, and, especially, are not able to replace one another [5].

R. Sweder used the adjective "intentional" in the synonymous series "imaginary," "fictional", "constructed," "virtual", as in the foundation of the world outlook lie stereotypes of perception and assessments, established within the framework of certain social and cultural paradigm [6]. Everything is created by the person in the course of life practice, is known and created within the framework of specific cultural systems, and therefore—in the line of dialogue interfaces of "thinking and logic." Self-identification, self-knowledge, self-acceptance, self-assertion, as intentional processes, in different cultures and at different stages of ontogenesis bear features of unique identity. The objectivity of the images of perception and estimates refined from the intentional beginning is fundamentally impossible. Hence the conclusion is that all types of interactions and, in particular, pedagogical interactions and pedagogical technologies, function as an intentional dialogue, as they are mediated by subjective motivational-target dominants of subjects.

3. Discussion

By borrowing the term "technology" from material production, the humanitarian sciences give it additional meaning. Humanitarian technologies are a consistent chain of action that, based on knowledge about man and society, creates conditions for self-realization of the individual, improvement of interpersonal and intergroup relations. Pedagogical technologies are, of course, a form of humanitarian technology.

G.K. Selevko notes that pedagogical technology is a consistent, step-by-step solution to a problem based on the principles of consistency, regularity of methods, techniques and actions used in it, which ensures that the educational process achieves a pre-planned result. Such a logically related sequence of actions cannot be arbitrarily broken without seriously compromising the effectiveness of the pedagogical process [7]. Modern pedagogical technologies are technologies of dialogue interactions in the system "students—training—educational environment—content of training—educational texts—culture—society." They are based on a humane attitude towards the individual, respect for his/her rights and freedoms, and the desire to provide targeted support for his/her self-development and self-realization. However, the issue of reproducibility of pedagogical technologies is a complex and sometimes intractable problem, as it is impossible to realize "one to one". Peculiarities of a specific pedagogical situation force to correct the whole system of pedagogical interactions.

Pedagogical technologies create conditions for the development of students, the criteria and vectors of which are inherent in the laws of transcendence of the person itself. At the same time, taking into account the compensatory nature of the human psyche, it becomes clear that the shortage of any one quality can be replenished by others, who ensure the success of its adaptation in sociocultural environments, profession, society, giving it a feature of unique identity.

Dialogue is at the heart of pedagogical technology. It should be noted that the problem of dialogue is gradually becoming one of the fundamental, systemically important in modern humanitarian knowledge. At the same time, it is necessary to note that there are discrepancies between the common and gradually developing scientific understanding of the term. In the ordinary sense, dialogue is a voice contact, the exchange of replicas of two or more subjects in connection with the transmission of some information.

Etymological analysis of the word "dialogue" shows that it is formed by two verbal elements: *dia* and *logos*. In ancient Greek, the prefix *dia* was used in meanings: a) through movement, penetration; b) distributed action; c) separation; d) reciprocity; e) strengthening; f) completeness [8]. Logos was also understood in a very significant way: word, speech, position, judgment, definition, saying, meaning. Thus, dialogue can be interpreted as interaction of subjects "through a word sense", "by means of a word sense", "because of a word sense". The original meaning of the word "dialogue" is not just the exchange of replicas, but the joint search and generation of new meaning intentions of the individual. In the performance of Socrates or Plato, dialectical "dialogue" is an eristic method of finding meaning, idea, definition, truth. In many ways, this process was understood as a process of auto-communication, the acquisition of meaning by a free citizen in the course of solving problematic problems.

M.M. Bakhtin believed that any forms of speech were fundamentally interactive because they had their destination. Speech always appeals to anyone, including in situations where this addressee is the fruit of the imagination of the subject himself. Monologue speech is inherent in dialogue, because it manifests the intentional components of the consciousness of the speaker (or writer), taking into account the intentionality of the person to whom the message is addressed. This conclusion also refers to monologue speech in the inner space of personality. The dialogue can be with an imaginary Other or an alternative (Alter Ego) as Another [9]. "Intentional dialogue" for us is an eristic subject-subject interaction, during which a new meaning is incremented, accepted values and stereotypes are rethinking, transition to a different sense area [10. P. 12-21].

Philosophers of Antiquity, classics of German philosophy (in particular, I. Kant. L. Feuerbach), and later - authors of status-role theory of personality (J. Mead, R. Linton, C. Cooley) showed that the mastering of social reality is connected with the "stratification" of I on dialogue interacting "I am» and "Me". The dialogue of these "internal opponents" allows to identify and reveal contradictions, to find ways to overcome them, to carry out existential elections. Such reflexive immersion in own consciousness, according to M. Buber, provides understanding of the inner world of other people, which, in turn, stimulates processes of personal and creative self-development. The individual builds his/her relations with culture, society, social institutions, social communities, Others and finally with himself/herself as the Other [5]. From this perspective, intentional dialogue can be understood as the basis of social adaptation and socialization.

On the one hand for the intentional dialogue to take place a "sense focus" (T.M. Dryze) is needed [12]. That is a zone within which the meanings of the participants of the interaction, although not fully coinciding, intentionally agree, "sympathize" (according to F. Tyutchev) with each other. The lack of "sense focus" among interacting entities inevitably leads to "failures" in understanding and the emergence of communicative barriers. An internal dialogue is not possible if the interacting actors do not have a common problem for analysis and discussion, or if the value positions of the parties are mutually exclusive. On the other hand, there should be some differences in understanding and experiences of the problem, supporting interest in it and the desire to discuss it jointly. That is why one of the im-

portant goals of education is to develop the ability to adequately "read" the meaning components of speech.

Meanings cannot be passed from one subject to another in their original form, they are every time reformed in the context of the intentional coordinates of a particular subject carrier. They form a complex and multi-tiered motivational-target system: from meanings that mediate individual behavioral acts in certain situations to meanings that form meaningful concept of personality. V. Frankl stressed that the generation and rethinking of meaning is the natural state of man. The meaninglessness of life, loss of its meaning inevitably leads to loss of life itself [13]. From this point of view, pedagogical interaction is, first of all, a dialogue of subjects, during which meanings are agreed by deconstructing them.

Internal dialogue becomes possible in the pedagogical process there and when a teacher and a student are open to communication, sincerely express their internal experiences and are interested in personal growth [14]. In these situations, bright existential discoveries can arise, changing the attitude of the subject to himself, to life, to others, to sociocultural reality and ways of self-realization in it. The difficulty is that the image I form can be emotionally attractive, but still illusory. Conversely, the intentional "deafness" in the form of a conscious or intuitive refusal to read the partner's intentions inevitably gives the pedagogical interaction a feature of formal contact. The ultimate goal of the pedagogical process is to assist learners in understanding the image of a true I.

4. Main Results

The intentional variety of pedagogical interactions is difficult to reduce to a limited set of models. From our point of view, we can highlight the following most general intentional positions, which contribute to the establishment of an emotionally interested dialogue in the pedagogical process:

a) achievement of a condition of dialogue of intentionality by overcoming social and psychological estrangement and establishment of motivational and target interrelations both between subjects, and between subjects and an information and substantial component of educational process;

b) achieving a state of sense empathy, in which all participants of pedagogical interaction appear as equal and open systems of sense birth;

c) joint sense search, which manifests itself in search of meaning focus by subjects of pedagogical interaction (i.e. zone of meaning matching);

d) development of a common meaning field in the joint value and cognitive practice of self-actualizing personality;

e) method of sense extrapolation, when incoming and conceived information is "sifted" through matrix of sense codes of consciousness of the subject of perception, as a result of which similar pulses are detected;

f) self-presentation, during which the own intentions of consciousness are opened to the meaning fields of Others. At the same time, not only the arsenal of verbal, but also other high-signature and second-signal systems can be used.

5. Conclusions

In modern society, the pre-existing monopoly of educational institutions on information has already been lost. In fact, the unlimited access of all segments of the population to any information requires a review of even those education-related postulates that previously seemed immutable. Today it is obvious that:

• Useful and valuable information for the person not only can be obtained, but most often is obtained from sources beyond the educational environment;

• Working with information received from outside the educational environment is painted with positive emotional experiences, while information with which learners interact within the environment does not have similar emotional appeal;

• Information with which learners interact in an educational environment is often perceived by them not as value, but as due. Its content, volume and time of development are regulated from the outside and poorly motivated by the internal sense system of students;

• The educational process is overloaded with content, the relevance of which, due to the limited social and cognitive experience of the students, raises doubts for them;

• The collective nature of learning often results in inefficient time and energy associated, for example, with situations where one has to "wait" or, conversely, "catch up";

• In the environment of an educational institution it is difficult to select and implement individual educational paths.

In the context of the information boom, a decisive rejection of the understanding of the subjects of the pedagogical process as "information machines" is necessary. The technology of internal dialogue can give a new impetus to the development of educational environments and actors integrated into them. Internal dialogue in the educational process contributes to the "melting" of information in the world of subjectivity and is a powerful tool for the development of the personality of students. It not only involves the exchange of meanings with others, but also stimulates the development of mechanisms of meaning birth, but at the same time—the activation of reflexive-analytical and cognitive processes. Dialogue-interacting individuals begin to realize themselves as socially active, activity subjects included in a variety of sociocultural environments, connections and relationships that realize their creative potential, consciously choose means and ways of personal development. The intentional dialogue provides an "exit" of the individual beyond the limits of his own subjectivity, the formation of a sense of responsibility for the existential elections being carried out.

Acknowledgement

References

[1] I. Herbart, General pedagogy, taken out of the purpose of education. [Electronic Resource], http://elib.gnpbu.ru/text/gerbart_glavneyshie-sochineniya_1906/go,14;fs,1/

[2] W. Dilthey, Pädagogik. Geschichte und Grundlinien des Systems. Dilthey W. Ge. Schriften. Bd. 9, 2. Aufl. Stuttgart—Göttingen, 1960:7.

[3] J. Dewey, Democracy and Education. M.: Pedagogy-Press, 2000.

[4] E. Gusserl, Phenomenological Psychology. Amsterdam reports. [Electronic Resource] http://filosof.historic.ru/books/item/f00/s00/z0000068.

[5] M. Buber, I and You. [Electronic Resource] http://www.philosophy.ru/library/bub/1html

[6] R. Sweder, The concept of extralationality. [Electronic resource] http://ethnopsyhology.narod.ru/study/cultpsych/Shweder.htm

[7] G.K. Seleevko, Modern educational technologies: Educational manual. Moscow: Folk education, 1998.

[8] Ancient Greek-Russian dictionary I.H. Butler, Under ed. S.I. Sobolovsky. [Electronic Resource] http://gurin.tomsknet.ru/alpha.html.

[9] M.M. Bakhtin, Aesthetics of verbal creativity. M.: Art Literature, 1979.

[10] I.V. Vinogradova, The inseparability of the space of dialogue with the space of communication in the educational process. http://anthropology.ru/ru/texts/vinogradova_iv/educdial_12.html

[11] E. Gusserl, Phenomenology. Article in the British Encyclopedia translation, foreword and notes of V.I. Molchanov. Logos, 1991, 1:12-21.

[12] T.M. Drydze, Social Communication as Text Activity in Seven-Sociopsychology. Social Sciences and Modernity, 1996, 3:145-152.

[13] V. Frankl, Man in search of meaning. M.: Progress, 1990.

[14] S. Bratchenko, Existential-Humanist Approach by James N. Ental: Lessons in Psychology. [Electronic Resource] http://psylib.org.ua/books/_brats02.htmPsycholog