

LINGUOCULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DIALOGUE TECHNOLOGIES FOR COGNITIVE ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION OF HIGHER SCHOOL STUDENTS IN THE PROCESS OF TEACHING HUMANITIES

Tetiana Mishenina

Prof. DSc, Kryvyi Rih State Pedagogical University,
e-mail: t.mishenina@gmail.com, Ukraine

Olena Hushko

lecturer, Kryvyi Rih Economic Institute of SHEE “Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman”, e-mail: pygmalion.utu@gmail.com, Ukraine

Abstract. The paper considers the task of the implementation of dialogue technologies with the account of linguocultural characteristics. The authors prove that communication is carried out in the process of dialogization (in the context of the research –educational one) which provides the formation of language, linguocultural and intercultural competencies. The paper outlines linguoculturemes, which are realized at different levels of the language system in general and nationally marked levels in particular. It is gradually proved that educational dialogization can be built with the account of semantic realizations of linguoculturemes. The authors present the classification of linguoculturemes, outline thematic groups of nationally marked vocabulary, used in the process of intercultural dialogization. They associate the formation of linguistic personality of future professionals with the working-out of the appropriate levels, achieved in the process of future specialists’ cognitive activity.

Keywords: dialogue technologies, linguocultural characteristics, cognitive activity, humanities, linguistic personality, linguocultureme.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23856/2207>

Introduction

Traditional system of teaching in higher educational establishments assigns a key role in developing and conducting practical classes to the teacher. According to the innovation strategy of the educational process educational dialogization is upraised to the foreground.

The concepts of communication structure represent three main components (functions, sides, components): three fundamental dimensions (characteristics, parameters) of communication: communicative reflection, communicative appeal and communicative attitude (Mjasishhev, 1995); communicative, interactive and perceptive components (Batsevych, 2007); cognitive, affective and regulatory functions (Kolominskij, 1972); gnostic, behavioral and affective components (Obozov, 1979); gnostic, praxeological and affective components of communication (Bodalev, 1982); informatory, regulatory and affective functions (Lomov, 1984).

The above mentioned allows developing a level of cognitive activity of students in the dialogical learning. It is determined by the following requirements: 1) reconstructing the professionally oriented environment in which the participants of a dialogue perform the roles of the bearers of definite social and professional roles; 2) taking into account psychological and age characteristics and the level of students’ language competence.

The analysis of the introduced groups of communication components shows that due to their psychological and pedagogical essence they are closely connected. That allows us to look at them as varieties within the outlined paradigm of the structure and functions of communication, expressing the content of information and cognitive, regulative and behavioral as well as emotional and affective components of the communication structure.

Implementation of dialogue technologies with the account of linguocultural characteristics

The aim of our paper is to outline the linguoculturological features of dialog technologies in organization of university students' cognitive activity in the process of teaching of humanities.

The conception of behavioral and regulatory along with interactive and effectual communication functions is associated with the manifestation of subjective activity of communication participants and peculiarities of their interaction. The potentiality is determined by the manifestation of intersubjective relativity – procedurality, contextuality and the correlation of subjectivity of communication participants, making possible the formation of linguistic identity. To reveal the nature of communication in close relationship with the intercourse let us briefly outline the features of manifestation of a linguistic personality and a communicative personality. While a linguistic personality (Batsevych, 2007) refers to a person who reveals himself/herself as one possessing a sufficient level of means of a native language code (*the code* is a system of symbols and rules of information transmission by channels of connection (communication) in accordance with socio-cultural peculiarities) in different communicative situations, a linguistic personality (Batsevych, 2007) is treated as a person possessing a unique cognitive base and knowledge of a specific idioethnic language at verbal, semantic, pragmatic and cognitive levels.

The implementation of language personality is carried out in the process of communication, which is traditionally defined as a set of connections and interactions of language personalities, societies and subjects within which there occurs an exchange of information, experience, abilities, skills and results of activity. Communication is a complex concept, covering all possible types of processes of connection and interaction between people: informational (information exchange), interactive (connections and influence of the participants); perceptive (perception by sensory receptors).

Accordingly, if the communication is one of necessary and universal conditions for the formation and development of the society and the personality, the communication is primarily associated with the information connection.

In the content of future specialists' philological training it is necessary to consider communication as one of the modes in the existence of phenomena (along with the language and speech); notional and ultimately semantic aspects of social interaction and communication; a complex, symbolic, personal and transactional process of the exchange of signs in the course of which we can observe the transmission of certain external or internal information, and also the display of status roles which the participants of communication take in regard to each other.

Communication is carried out in the process of dialogization (in our case – the training one), which provides the formation of language, linguocultural and intercultural communication (*tab. 1*):

Table 1

Competence	Realization
Language competence	participants of intercultural communication know the language (language code) of communication, first of all have a good command of all language levels, the style of language and speech, the rules for creating language constructions and messages (Batsevych,2007)
Linguocultural competence	interlocutors know basic culture elements (national customs, traditions, realities) of the country, the language of which is used for communication; able to identify in the language the informationspecific for this country and use it to achieve the intended communicative purpose; able to carry out cross-cultural communication, which requires knowledge of lexical units with a national-cultural semantic component and skills of their appropriate use in the situations of intercultural communication as well as the ability to use background knowledge to achieve understanding in the situations of indirect and direct intercultural communication (Batsevych,2007)
Intercultural competence	participants of intercultural communication know habits, customs, laws and regulations of a specific communication society, a national linguocultural community, which form individual and group motivation purposes, types of behaviour (especially – the communicative one), non-verbal components (gestures, facial expressions); national and cultural traditions, systems of values (Batsevych,2007)

Considering that the intercultural communication is understood as a communication of people from different cultures, who speak different languages. So at the linguocultural level, it is primarily a particular type of culture, which is characterized by the interaction of national cultures, ethnic and cultural competence of individuals, the desire to achieve interethnic consent in all areas of communication.

The observation of the cultural stock (as a complex of knowledge, a certain outlook, the orientation in the areas of the national and world culture, which a typical representative of a certain culture possesses and a set of basic units included in a certain national culture) of the languages under study may serve as a good example (tab. 2):

Table 2

Ukrainian and English linguocultures

<i>Linguocultureme</i>	Dictionary meaning	Linguocultural interpretation
accumulates both linguistic concepts and inherent extra-linguistic cultural environment; can be expressed in a word, a phrase, a sentence or a		

<p>text; is a carrier of a connotative meaning, which is fully realized only in cases of thorough familiarity with the language and the culture of a particular ethnic group.</p>		
<p>Towel</p>	<p>1) a long piece of fabric (cotton, linen) used for drying oneself or wiping things dry; <i>Typical for Ukrainian (you won't find this meaning in the English dictionary):</i> 2) a piece of decorative fabric with an embroidered or woven ornament; traditionally used for house decoration as well as the Ukrainian folk rituals</p>	<p>For the Ukrainian people the towel is a symbol of the family: the bride and the bridegroom used to stand on the towel at the wedding ('And we were standing on a towel, and we were taking our oath...' – folklore); to prepare/take/bring towels to send for towels 'Standing on a towel' is associated with different stages of the ceremony related to the readiness of a girl for a family life, her engagement and marriage. It is the symbol of ritualism (the baby was taken with a towel from a birthing mother; a towel was used for binding a beam on a house, giving a send-off before a long journey – the symbol of the way); towels, hung in the house, act as protective amulets</p>
<p>Tea</p>	<p>1) a hot drink made by infusing the dried crushed leaves of the tea plant in boiling water 2) the evergreen shrub or small tree which produces tea leaves, native to southern and eastern Asia and grown as a major cash crop <i>Typical for English (you won't find this meaning in the Ukrainian dictionary)</i></p>	<p>For the British tea is a symbol of refreshing comfort, warmth, home, family, friends and life. ('If the day is a sentence, tea for me is the punctuation.' – Andy Callaghan); to have/drink/sip tea to ask/invite to tea to pour tea morning/afternoon/high tea The word is widely used in idioms and set phrases: - all the tea in China (a</p>

	<p>3) a meal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - breakfast, typically consisting of a hot drink and bread; - afternoon tea – a light afternoon meal consisting typically of tea to drink, sandwiches, and cakes; - high tea – a meal eaten in the late afternoon or early evening, typically consisting of a cooked dish, bread and butter, and tea. 	<p>priceless amount or value; something of such great value that it cannot be quantified);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be not (one's) cup of tea (To not be something one prefers, desires, enjoys, or cares about); - weak tea (slang Something that is particularly underwhelming or unimpressive), etc. <p>Tea in English Literature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ‘As far as her mom was concerned, tea fixed everything. Have a cold? Have some tea. Broken bones? There's a tea for that too. Somewhere in her mother's pantry, Laurel suspected, was a box of tea that said, 'In case of Armageddon, steep three to five minutes'. (<i>Illusions</i> by Aprilynne Pike); - ‘In Britain, a cup of tea is the answer to every problem. Fallen off your bicycle? Nice cup of tea. Your house has been destroyed by a meteorite? Nice cup of tea and a biscuit. Your entire family has been eaten by a Tyrannosaurus Rex that has travelled through a space/time portal? Nice cup of tea and a piece of cake.’ (<i>Mr Stink</i> by David Williams).
--	---	---

The cultural stock allows observing the cultural background of the word – the description of nominative units, which represent the phenomena of social life and historical events.

In the context of the biomorphic code of the culture, which reflects the conceptions of a certain national linguocultural community about the world of plants and animals we can observe the stereotypes of the culture, the perception and assessment in its terms of the whole creation that surrounds a man (tab. 3).

Table 3

Biomorphic code of linguocultures

Type of culture	Word	Literal translation into Ukrainian	Peculiarities of linguocultural interpretation
English	Rose Oak (a tree)	Роза Дуб	The Rose of England, was adopted as a symbol of peace and merges a white rose (representing the Yorkists) and a red rose (representing the Lancastrians). During the War of the Roses, these two sides fought over the control of the royal house. The Oak is the national tree of England, representing strength and endurance. The Royal Oak and Oak Apple Day commemorate the escape of King Charles II from the grasps of the parliamentarians after his father's execution; he hid in an oak tree to avoid detection before making it safely into exile. The Major Oak is an 800- to 1000-year-old oak in Sherwood Forest, fabled as the principal hideout of Robin Hood.
Ukrainian	Periwinkle Cherry (a fruit tree)	Барвінок Вишня	The Periwinkle is a symbol of life and immortality; first love, virginity, sanctity of marriage, a young man, the universe (to pick a periwinkle means to go on a date; A blossoming periwinkle – a confession of love; A periwinkle in full bloom – a happy marriage; A faded periwinkle – an unhappy marriage) The Cherry is a symbol of a girl; parental home; a family

In the process of language learning it is methodically reasonable to use linguocultural comparisons that involve the procedures of identifying similarities and differences in languages and cultures of different national linguocultural communities. As an example we represent a table with linguocultural comparisons within Slavic, Germanic and Romance languages (tab. 4):

Table 4

**Comparison of the lists of months
in Slavic, Germanic and Romance languages**

Ukrainian	Polish	Russian	English	French	Latin
Січень	Styczeń	Январь	January	Janvier	Ianuaris
Лютий	Luty	Февраль	February	Février	Februarius
Березень	Marzec	Март	March	Mars	Martius
Квітень	Kwiecień	Апрель	April	Avril	Aprilis
Травень	Maj	Май	May	Mai	Maius
Червень	Czerwiec	Июнь	June	Juin	Iunius
Липень	Lipiec	Июль	July	Juillet	Iulius
Серпень	Sierpień	Август	August	Août	Augustus
Вересень	Wrzesień	Сентябрь	September	Septembre	September
Жовтень	Październik	Октябрь	October	Octobre	October
Листопад	Listopad	Ноябрь	November	Novembre	November
Грудень	Grudzień	Декабрь	December	Décembre	December

In the content of professional training of future specialists the activation of cognitive activity allows forming alinguistically cultural personality – a person who possesses a unique cognitive base, the knowledge of all levels of a particular idioethnic language, culture (especially spiritual one), flexible communicative strategies and tactics, common within a particular national linguistic community. The concept of communication involves a linguistic personality who has a handle on a speech situation, reveals individual communicative behaviour (communication style) as a functionally stylistic variety of a linguistic code.

In the integral structure model of a linguistic personality we distinguish the following levels of language proficiency:

- *verbal and semantic* level determines the proficiency level of a native language based on the knowledge of a language system;
- *linguo-cognitive* level allows building the linguistic picture of the world by regularizing and systemizing individual concepts, conceptual words, images;
- *motivational and pragmatic* level (*of pragmatic communicative needs*) promotes the awareness of the system of motives and personal values in the linguistic picture of the world.

The above characterized levels correlate with the definite components. These are the components of values, of worldview, culturological, personal, cognitive, behavioural and that of language proficiency and linguistic feeling. They represent the complex formation of a linguistic personality and are initially formed in the process of educational communication (tab. 5).

Levels of the cultural code of a linguistic personality correlate with linguoculturemes in accordance with thematic characteristics.

The vocabulary with national and cultural specific character covers the following thematic groups:

- material culture (national symbols, traditional dwelling, household utensils, tools, food and drinks, traditional clothing, centres of public gathering);
- social rituals and customs (family traditions and rituals, calendar holidays and ceremonies, labour traditions and holidays);

- society organization (family, clan, economic activity, crafts and trades);
- knowledge about the world and the nature (astronomy, meteorology, demonology, flora, fauna);
- quantity and calculation (mathematics, metrology);
- health of people and animals (traditional healers, diseases);
- etiquette (greetings, wishes (congratulations), family relationships, etc.);
- abstract concepts (fortune, misfortune, happiness, grief, truth, lies, wealth, poverty, etc.).

Table 5

Components of linguistic personality

Of Values	System of values
Of Worldview	System of reasons for existence
Culturological	Level of culture mastering
Personal	Individual
Cognitive	Understanding of lexical and idiomatic potential, grammatical forms and structures, stylistic diversity of the native language
Behavioural	Linguistic behaviour, behaviour in typical communicative situations
Of Language Proficiency and Linguistic Feeling	Ability of an individual to present own views according to linguistic norms and select from the possible options the most successful and accurate in semantic and stylistic regard

Thematically defined linguocultures are implemented at different levels of the language system in general and at nationally coloured levels in particular. Educational dialogization can be built with the account of semantic realizations of linguocultures (tab. 6):

Table 6

Levels of the cultural code of a linguistic personality:

Linguocultureme
Linguocultureme – a real thing (a language sign, naming a national artefact, which does not have a verbal equivalent in a different culture) For example: a) Ukrainian: <i>щедрівка (shchedrivka); вертен (vertep); бандура (bandura); цимбали (symbals); вареники (vareniki); борщ (borsch); мазанка (mazanka); тин (tin)</i> ; b) English: <i>bill (білль), cottage (cottage), pub (паб), cricket (крикет), golf (гольф), hamburger (hamburger), sandwich (сандвіч), lift (ліфт)</i>
Significative linguocultureme (the denotatum is common for the cultures under comparison while the significatums differ in the importance and content of cultural information) For example: a) Ukrainian: <i>батько-мати (mother-father); батьківщина (спадщина) (homeland (heritage)); кобзар (kobza-player); подавати рушники (to bring towels, which can mean according to the context – to give the consent to the marriage)</i> ; b) English: <i>mother-</i>

father, homeland(heritage), a northerner, a piece of cake (according to the context can have a meaning of something very easy or easily achieved)

Connotative linguocultureme

(contains cultural information only through the connotation of a language sign while its subjective conceptual content is identical or very similar in the compared languages)

For example: a) Ukrainian: *барвінок* (*periwinkle*); *мак* (*poppy*); *чорнобривці* (*marigolds*); *тополя* (*poplar*); *криниця* (*well*); *ластівкат* (*swallow*); *лелека* (*stork*); b) English: *shamrock*; *bluebell*; *thistle*; *daffodil*; *oak*; *lion*; *apple pie*; *cats and dogs*

Trope and figurative linguoculturemes of mythological, folk and poetic, idiomatic and of written literature origin. Having a culturological sense in the denotation of the content they, as a result of a sense transfer and a shift in meanings, acquire an additional connotative culturological sense.

For example: a) Ukrainian: *Сонячна доля* (lit. (literal) *Sunny fortune*); *сонячні кларнети* (lit. *sunny clarinets*); *квітчаста батьківщина вишні й соловейка* (Б.І. Антонич) (lit. *the flowery motherland of the cherry-tree and the nightingale* (B.I. Antonych)); *Я вас люблю, як сіль свою Сиваш / як ліс у груднісвій листок останній* (Вінграновський) (lit. *I love you like the Sivash loves its salt and like the wood in December loves its last leaf* (Vinhranovskyi)); b) English: *Bloody Nora*; *the bee's knees*; *a mist before one's eyes*; *She Walks in Beauty, Like the Night* (Lord Byron); *like a curate's wife to whom the squire's lady was being very kind* (W. S. Maugham)

Linguoculturemes – a phraseological unit of ethnic, colloquial and written literature origin

For example: a) Ukrainian: *Розрута могила* (*Devastated grave*) / *В своїй хаті своя правда і сила, і воля* (*In your own home – your own truth, your strength, you will*) / *Наша дума, наша пісня не вмре, не загине* (*Our thought, our song won't die and won't be lost*); b) English: *Let's shitteroad* / *One swallow doesn't make a summer* / *Out of the blue* / *Go to the bow-wows*

Linguoculturemes – folk nouns

(based on month names; traditional festivals; astronomical, earthly and biomorphic picture of the world)

For example: a) Ukrainian: *березень* (*March*) – *бурильний, веснявець, весномрій, весноклич, весновій, крапельник, первоцвіт, птахограй, радо світ, соняшник* (*sunflower*) – *сонцеклонник, сонцелюб, сонцезбриз*; b) English: *Plough Monday*; *Shrove Tuesday*; *Rochester's Sweeps Festival*; *autumn – fall, crown of the year; sere and yellow leaf; the fall of the leaf; spring – springtime, ice run, prime; spring tide, the prime of the year, vernal season, Mae, youth; winter – wintertime, winter-tide, hog season, hiems, Mister Hawkins; April (Aprilis, April day, April fish, April Fool's Day, April Fool, April shower)*

Symbolic linguoculturemes (symbolic and substantive) – linguistic signs with cultural content, expressing characteristic features of the world perception of a national linguoculture and perceived in the society like symbols

For example: a) Ukrainian: *Україна* (*Ukraine*); *Дніпро – Славути* (*Dnipro – Slavuta*); *Кобзар* (lit. *Kobza-player*); *Каменяр* (lit. *Stonemason*); *Великий Луг* (lit. *Great Meadow – Velyki Luh*); *Хортиця* (*Khortytisia*); *Чумацький Шлях* (lit. *the choomaks' way – the Milky Way*); b) English: *Big Ban*; *The London Eye*; *The Tower*; *Stonehenge*; *The Tube*; *Peter Pen*; *beefeater*; *pub*; *Houses of Parliament*; *Magna Charta*; *Bill of Rights*; *William the Conqueror*; *Guy Fawkes*

Symbolic linguoculturemes of social and national behaviour

(language etiquette)

Forexample: a) Ukrainian: *Добридень! (Good afternoon!); Перепрошую! (Sorry!); Моє шанування! (My compliments!); Слава Ісусу! (Glory be to Jesus Christ!) Боже помози! (God help us);* b) English: *How do you do! I beg your pardon! Thank God! Good Gracious! Don't mention it!*

Educational communication in general and didactic communication within the linguoculturological discourse is defined as the interaction process, resulting in the transformation of each participant's state and bringing it to the maximum possible proximity to the mutual state, which as an integral whole comprises the consistency of opinions and estimates. Therefore, as a result of communication we do not have just an exchange of views and ideas but the state transformation of each subject (object) into their comparable property, mutual experience and common knowledge.

Conclusions and suggestions

To summarize, the main function of dialogization (didactic communication) taking into account linguocultural characteristic is changing by one of the subjects (an addresser – a teacher) of attitudes, beliefs, actions, knowledge, abilities and skills of another subject (a recipient – a student) sometimes pursuing his/her own interests or, as a rule, according to the realities of socio-cultural reality.

The particular qualities of a dialogical discourse are first of all revealed in its professional focus. Linguocultural characteristic of educational communication in terms of higher educational establishment is characterized by a threefold focus on educational cooperation, future professionals (relevant state, promising lines of development) and the subject of learning. At the same time educational dialogization in the process of professional training of future specialists is notable for its subjects' personal, sociocultural and subject orientation.

Further research will be focused on the development of dialogue techniques with due consideration of the parameters of communicative behaviour and linguocultural distance.

References

- Andreeva, G.M. (1980). Social psychology. Moscow, Russia: Moscow University Press.*
Batsevych, F.S. (2007). The dictionary of terms for intercultural communication. Kyiv, Ukraine: Dovira.
Bodalev, A.A. (1982). Personality and communication: Selected Works. Moscow, Russia: Pedagogy.
Kolominskij, J.L. (1972, January). Social standards as stabilizing factors of 'social psyche' Questions of psychology, 1, 99-110.
Lomov, B.F. (1984). Methodological and theoretical problems of psychology. Moscow, Russia: Nauka.
Mjasishhev, V.N. (1995). Psychology of relationship. Voronezh, Russia: Publishing House of the Institute of Applied Psychology "MODEKS"
Obozov, N. (1979). Interpersonal relations. Leningrad, Russia: Leningrad State University.