

INNOVATION, WORK, SOCIETY

PHILOSOPHY OF COMMUNICATIVE SPACE, AS A COMPLEX MULTICOMPONENT STRUCTURE

Nataliya Avdymyrets

Postgraduate Student at the Department of History, Archeology and Philosophy,
Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky State Pedagogical University, Ukraine
e-mail: ukrnata71@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0001-4981-4726

Summary

It was found that the end result of professional training of student youth is communicative competence. Communicative-dialogic competence acts as a hierarchically organized mental formation, as a certain level of development of the individual, which involves the formation of its holistic system of motivational, personal qualities and functional-operational manifestations that implement emotional, cognitive and behavioral components of personality.

The most important problem of modern science of the last decades, which is obliged to form persistent guidance and meanings of realization of diverse cultural interests and values in students, is the problem of substantiation of communicative-dialogic competence, the choice of ways of full-fledged, comprehensive, harmonious improvement of students and their lives. The position of “communication” is basic because it defines a wide range of communicative and informational interactions of personality in the process of educational and professional activity. Thus, the development of various forms of communicative competence of a modern person, the conceptual content of which we define as a systemic algorithm is actualized. The main component of the algorithm is the communicative potential, which contains the communicative talent of the personality and the knowledge necessary for the realization of communication.

It is concluded that the communicative competence of student youth is a very important component of a broad and complex problem – the formation of its professionally significant qualities. Philosophical support for the development of communicative and dialogical competence of student youth in the cultural and educational space primarily involves the dialectic of communication, and in this competence decisively encourages the individual to choose the socio-cultural communicative sphere where his subjective qualities will be demanded and realized.

Keywords: multicomponent structure, student youth, communicative competence.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23856/4024>

1. Introduction

In the early twenty-first century, the process of world development significantly affected the practice of world communication exchange, in particular thoughts. Much of modern social space is involved in a new communicative reality. Today, due to technology, you can

communicate with a much larger number of people than in the past and without much effort. It is a question of the need to solve specific social problems of people, as well as problems that are primarily associated with the philosophical understanding of the spiritual world of a person.

2. Analysis of recent research and publications

Scientific works in the field of philosophical and didactic study of communication competence of the individual combine elements of methodologies of various humanities – primarily humanities and natural sciences. The basis for solving the problem of preparing future psychologists for professional communication is the philosophical and psychological concepts of communication. Thus, the methodological problems of communicative competence in general and communication in particular are analyzed in the works by K. O. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, G. M. Andreeva, O. O. Bogdaleva, L. P. Buyeva, M. S. Kolan, S. D. Maksimenko, O. M. Leontiev, B. F. Lomov, B. D. Parygin and others. The versatile aspects of professional communication are revealed in studies of G. O. Ball, V. M. Galuziak, A. B. Dobrovych, M. M. Zabrotsky, V. O. Kan-Kalyk, Ya. L. Kolomensky, M. N. Kornev, O. V. Kyrychuk, S. O. Musatov, V. A. Semychenko, L. E. Orban-Lembryk, T. M. Tytarenko, Yu. M. Shvalby, T. S. Yatsenko. According to their research the sphere of communication activities of students include numerous forms of exchange of information and knowledge between students, teachers and specialists who focus on a single system of behavioral models and paradigms in their daily life or in the process of professional activity. Such scholars as O. O. Verbytsky, Yu. M. Yemelyanov, M. P. Zazhyrko, V. V. Kopylnsky, M. O. Kots, L. A. Petrovska, S. V. Petrushyn et al. fruitfully study psychological and pedagogical conditions and means of development of the communicative potential of the individual.

The objective of our work is to define the general principles, developed on the basis of the study of communication processes, individual ways of involving students into an active exchange of ideas in order to identify the peculiarities of the development of communicative competence of students and to denote the ways of increasing its effectiveness in the process of training.

The object of the study is the definition of the philosophical aspect of the communicative space as a complex multicomponent structure.

The subject of the study is the process of developing the communicative competence of students in the cultural and educational space.

3. Presentation of the main research material

Characteristic differences between the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century are changes in the system of education: its orientation, goals, content, etc., which are largely oriented towards the free development of the individual, creative initiative, independence. The logical result of professional training in the aggregate of motivational, value, cognitive and other components is the communicative-dialogic competence of students in the cultural and educational space.

In scientific literature there are concepts that are similar in content or identical. Thus, the term “competence in communication” is used as the ability to overcome the difficulties in communicating, primarily of social – perceptual plan, the ability to reflex their own manifestations in communication and use the information obtained for self-knowledge. In our opinion, the dialogue in this context began to be interpreted as the readiness of the individual to communicate (Klymenko V. A., 2005).

In foreign literature there is a term “competence of interaction” (intencioncompeten-ties). Thus M. Athay and J. Darley define the competence of interaction as the ability to create new patterns of role play by reconstructing familiar, practical examples that enable them to act in specific, varied interaction situations (*Formanovskaya N. I., and other; 2009*).

According to G. Hegel, the spirit is the spiritual development of an individual who wakes up in a person for self-knowledge and undergoes a series of stages, culminating in absolute knowledge, that is, knowledge of those forms and laws that govern the entire process of spiritual development from the inside. Based on Hegelian dialectic, we note that mediation is a central category that characterizes the inherent process in which value and meaning arise. In Hegel’s language, the general limits itself to private and, therefore, becomes in-itself for itself in the procedural moment of the division of the private, thus creating a brilliant waltz, in which the boundaries of the concept of world and spirit are erased. Of course, a detailed study of the entire ontological concept of the development of the spirit presented in the philosophy of G. Hegel, within the scope of short notes, is not possible.

However, at this time, we are not accidentally appealing to the notion of communication, which allows in a certain way to distinguish the paradoxical and dialectical nature of communication. In doing so, we must take into account the philosophical interpretations of this concept by other scholars working in the field of communication studies.

John Dewey, who was well aware of the root cause of Hegelian pragmatism, wrote in his book “Experience and Nature”: “of all the things – communication is something weird”. He studies the general mediation (with support of the Hegelian theory), in the new materialistic, secular understanding as a process of communication, through which and in which a person, society, and, probably, nature, exist.

Starting from the 1960s and 1970s, the concepts of competence and communicative competence were introduced into the scientific circle. From 1970-1990, the term “communicative competence” is introduced into the system of learning management and communication.

At this time J. Ravenin his studies extends the structural model of competence to such categories as “readiness”, “ability”, and also focuses on certain psychological qualities, such as “responsibility”, “confidence” (*Klymenko V. A., 2005*). Social dialogue is gradually becoming an actual form of relations. According to many scholars (V. Tsvyh, D. Neplypa, V. Yevtukh, V. Sagatovsky, etc.), in fact, it is a prerequisite for the deployment and development of interpersonal, intergroup, interstate ties and relations. Consequently, there is a need for optimal study and interpretation of the possibilities of social dialogue as a special form of dialogue. One of the aforementioned approaches, in our opinion, acquires a methodological value, contributes to the understanding of the nature of the phenomenon under study. For example, O. Troitska defines this term as a relationship between two or more persons that exchange ideas, primarily on socio-political topics, and try to find effective ways to use it (*Troitska O. M., 2016: 84 – 85*). It should be noted at the same time that in a number of scientific papers the models of forming communicative competence are presented as the final result of professional training of students.

It is significant that in scientific researches of this period the concept of competence is interpreted differently: both as a synonym for professionalism and as one of its components. So, L. A. Petrovska notes that communicative competence combines understanding of motives, intentions, strategies of behavior, frustration of communication partners, understanding of socio-psychological problems of mutual understanding, mastery of communication techniques. The researcher, based on the results of his observations on the conceptual content of communicative competence, offers specific, special forms of terms for the formation of this property in relation to the personality of a specialist (*Klymenko V. A., 2005*).

It seems to us that the urgent question is, if the philosophy of communication should contain such an understanding of substantiality or not?

In our opinion, if this concept of substance as a constructive utopia in the mediation of the general and the private, which is communication, is really recognized in philosophy, then philosophical methods must change, the consciousness of philosophy must also change and the attitude of philosophy to art and science must change. According to this, the key issue of utopian substantiality, taken as the basis of our attempts to develop the philosophical concept of communication, has a significant importance for philosophy to comprehend the internal and external factors of the development of communication theory.

For critical theory and human practice, it may be necessary to rethink the relation to the essential in being and the subtlety of substantiality. In this regard, studying communication can help us come to realize what is at the center of this approach.

However, we have previously discussed just one idea that we consider to be important. In fact, the field of the philosophical communicative space is much wider and much more meaningful. In addition, in a number of areas and in many ways, it relates to other research and practice areas. All those who are united by the idea of the philosophy of communication, are aware of the infinite variety of what we are just beginning to study.

In a short time the problem of communicative-dialogic competence became an authoritative forum for discussing new directions and new ways of reflection of the phenomenon of communication.

This is explained by the fact that the philosophy of communication is not only a critical reflection of a subject and discussion of general ideas about communication, their role and functions in human existence. The philosophy of communication itself is an inalienable and essential criterion for measuring communication. There is a well-known aphorism: any communication inevitably becomes a communication of communication as such. The meaning of this statement is most fully disclosed in the fact that just starting communication, we immediately find it necessary to interpret it and cannot remain unanswered in terms of communication. As I. Kant notes this circumstance makes philosophy an internal matter of public use of reason, and this makes communication always open to questions in which it itself, through its own reality, its purpose, self-knowledge, comes to new questions. Moreover, perhaps, the original possibility of a miracle of philosophy is a question that we put to life, and the question which life addresses to us. It indicates the fundamental communication between a person and the world.

In this communication, both sides remain incomplete, open, inclined to dialogue. Communication implies the presence of an ontological dimension that in the traditions of classical philosophy is defined as the unity of opposites, that is, the categories of identity and differences, individual and plural in being.

That is why we are returning to the question about the ontology of communication, about communication in general as a phenomenon. We will consider possible transformations of the conceptual content, the ontology of communication on the basis of the use of the conceptual approach of one of the leading representatives of contemporary continental philosophy of Alan Badiou. It is important to reveal the potential of his philosophy as a possible new perspective in the theory of communication.

It should be noted that communicative-dialogic competence is a complex, multicomponent process of establishing and developing contacts between people, created by the needs of joint activities, combining the exchange of information, the development of a unified strategy of interaction, acceptance and understanding of another person.

Many researchers of the problem of communication singled out different types of communication. L. V. Mudrik examines the most typical types of communication inherent in a

person: verbal speech, “printed word”, painting, cinema, music, television, magnetic and phono recordings. The notion of “communication” can be applied to many spheres of human activity. Depending on means which broadcast it, they distinguish language communication (written and spoken language), paralinguistic communication (facial expressions, gestures, melody), material-sign (products of production, fine arts, etc.) (*Mischuk I. M., 2006: 64 – 67*).

M. V. Druzhininotes that currently they distinguish two phases of development of the communicative approach – functional-pragmatic and culturological (*Artemchuk O. G., 2010*).

More than 30 years ago B.G. Ananievfor the first time comprehensively highlighted the problem of how important it is to take into account the category of communication among other determinants which define the manifestation and development of the human psyche (*Konovalenko T. V., 2006*). In a series of works, the author emphasizes the idea that in his everyday life a person is bound by an infinite number of relationships not only with the objective world, but also with people. The author notes that the mechanism by which these relations with the world of objects and the world of people are established and developed, is activity – labor, communication, education, game etc. Therefore, distinguishing communication from this series, the author emphasizes that a special and main characteristic of communication as an activity is that it is through communication a person builds his relationship with the outside world and other people (*Konovalenko T. V., 2006*).

It should be emphasized that there are at least two persons participating in the communication act as the main condition for the communication. In addition, at least one of them should have a certain topic for conversation, thought, idea. That is, as B. G. Ananiev notes, in order for communication to take place, the presence of the subject, the addressee, the common language and the subject of the conversation is necessary. But a communicative act is not limited by these components, since it is a very complicated process of human influence (*Konovalenko T. V., 2006*).

We note that Badiou criticizes the ideas of Jürgen Habermas, one of the leading contemporary European philosophers, in particular his conception of communicative rationality. Alan Badiou seems to be finally determined between the relativism of postmodernism (as the impossibility of rational philosophizing on universality and infinity) and the pragmatic salvation of reason (and, with it, the critical social theory), in the theories of practical and communicative legitimization of rational. Criticizing postmodernists, he insists on the absolute necessity of discourses of truth and universality. However, Y. Habermas puts forward the thesis of incommunicativeness of the truth of an event, believing that the event, although constituting in terms of communicativeness, is repeated every time, requiring certain decisions and a real engagement in what is happening, from all participants in the event. The danger which lies in interpretations of the truth of an event, is connected with the possibility of interpreting pseudo-event as an event. It is no less noticeable or no more significant than the danger that lies in such a spread of the concept of truth that we have been observing in philosophy for a very long time.

It should also be noted that the communicative competence of students is a rather important component of a broad and complex problem – the formation of their professionally significant qualities. In practical terms, the solution to this problem is the increasing the level of efficiency of any activity.

We define and compare communicative competence, for example, of engineers and practical psychologists. Unlike real engineering activities, students solve tasks, partly detached from the current problems. With the traditional and consistently disciplined approach to training a technical specialist, there happens “the blurring” of the idea that all aspects of a single whole are inextricably linked together meaningfully and functionally. An engineer must have not only a systemic idea of a technical object, but he generally needs: information on the conditions of operation; a clear understanding of the nature of the interaction between the individual

subsystems of the complex device and the exhaustive data on all the tools (intellectual, informational and material) that can be used principally to meet all the requirements of the customer for the manufacture of the technical product. So, we hope that these questions can inspire us to use the extremely fruitful ideas of A. Badiou to deepen understanding of communication ontologically as an event, and in the realization aspect – as practice.

A. Badiou's work became an important milestone in modern continental philosophy, especially because of the perspectives that this philosophy offers to advance beyond the limits of the philosophical boundary that many scholars consider to be the end of postmodern thinking. A. Badiou tries to reconcile the ideas of contingency and plurality with the idea of definitely certain, and does so in the context of radically materialist philosophical discourse. The basis of his philosophy is stated by the statement that "ontology is mathematics" (it is strictly defined theoretically), and that idea which cannot be thought in mathematics, becomes an event: a "gap", in which one can find a new as an excess of the original situation, and which always saves some element of not named. Badiou, perhaps, somewhat arbitrarily recognizes four branches, where the "gap" turns out to be novelty: science, politics, art, love. In a philosophical plan, the potential of composition ('compossibility') of events in these four branches is considered in any historical context or social circumstances.

In the opinion of N. I. Formanovska, in order to arise a linguistic communication, a number of conditions are needed, which are currently being sought by many scholars. It has been established that in order to successfully master the language, a language situation consisting of elements should be simulated: who – whom – about what – where – when – why. Any linguistic interaction is conditioned and organized by at least the named elements – the external conditions of communication and the internal reactions of those who communicate, and in the complex eventually is reflected in one or another phase (*Taranenko I. M., and other; 1996: 57–60*).

According to M. K. Petrov, the acquisition of any specialty by a person imposes an imprint on the specifics of his general cultural erudition, the manner of behavior, the style of thinking. Moreover, the cultural "substrate" on which this disciplinary education is superimposed also plays a significant role (even if they receive the same education, representatives of different social strata can become completely incompatible carriers of the same professional subculture). However, this does not prevent people from communicating and understanding each other – simply because any education primarily involves the sociocultural socialization of the subject and only then – his specialization and professionalization. That is why the significant differences in the thesaurus of subjects do not in any way violate the communicative culture of society as a social integrity, because this kind of variation is originally laid down in it as its immanent property (*Istratova O. N., 2005*). But, in our opinion, it is obvious that the position of communication is basic, since it captures a wide range of communicative and informational interactions of personality in the process of educational and professional activity. Thus, the development of various forms of communication competence of a modern person is actualized, the conceptual content of which we interpret as a system algorithm with the main component – the communicative potential, which combines the communicative talent of the individual and the knowledge necessary for the implementation of communication (*Istratova O. N., 2005*).

There is no doubt that communication as a socio-psychological phenomenon (communication) manifests itself only in a situation of interaction.

Consequently, we conclude that the purpose of communicative-dialogic competence is the mutual desire to start the process of communication. The qualitative characteristic of the purpose of communicative-dialogic competence is its presence or lack among participants of communication (*Andreeva G. M., 2006*).

Thus, the means and definition of the essence of the communicative and dialogic competence of students in the cultural and educational space are the operations and methods by which the task is achieved. They provide a process for transferring knowledge, skills and abilities and the formation of personal qualities among students. One of the decisive criteria is communicative. The communicative component includes:

- 1) the establishment of a proper relationship with a person;
- 2) the organization of personal activities.

With the aim of determining the philosophical potential and the role of communicative-dialogic competence of student youth, as well as the justification of the system of philosophical support in order to note the general, developed on the basis of study of communication processes, individual ways of involving students in an active exchange of thoughts, which is to identify the features of the development of communicative competence of student youth and the definition of means to increase its efficiency in the process of training, the necessity of defining and studying the structural components step by step becomes apparent.

It should be noted that in the structure of communicative-dialogic competence it is expedient to distinguish the following components:

- gnostic component (a system of knowledge about the essence, structure, functions and features of communication in general and professional communication in particular, knowledge about the style of communication, in particular, about the features of their own communicative style; creative thinking, as a result of which communication acts as a kind of social creativity);
- the constituent component (general and specific communicative skills that allow to successfully establish contact with another person, adequately recognize his internal states, manage the situation of interaction with him, apply constructive strategies of behavior in conflict situations, the culture of speech, expressive skills that provide adequate expression of the pantomime support; perceptually reflexive skills that provide the opportunity to know the partner's inner world in communicating and understanding himself);
- emotional component (humanistic orientation for communication, interest in another person, willingness to associate with him in personal, dialogical relationships, interest in their own inner world, developed empathy and reflection, high level of identification with performed professional and social roles, positive I-concept, adequate requirements of professional activity of the psycho-emotional state).

For the most part, communicative-dialogic competence is interpreted as one of the operational-cognitive components of psychological readiness of students in the cultural and educational space. Competences within the structure of communicative-dialogic competence correspond to a set of knowledge and skills necessary for effective communication in the process of carrying out professional activities. The main components of communicative competence are communicative personality characteristics that characterize the development of the need for communication, the attitude to the way of communication; communicative abilities, ability to have an initiative in communication; ability to show activity, actively react to the state of the partners in communication, to form and realize their own individual program of communication. Communicative-dialogic competence appears in general as knowledge of norms and rules of communication, mastery of their technology.

In recent decades, many researchers have been studying the category of social dialogue and the notion of "communicative competence". The analysis of different methods of research of these concepts allowed to reveal the essence of philosophical potential and the role of communicative-dialogic competence.

The researchers of the social dialogue, M. Vak, A. Gryaznov, D. Nelipa, V. Tsvyh and others emphasize the obligatory components of the dialogue structure (subjects, subject of discussion, place of action, time of action) and its certain “dialogical” features and characteristics (the state of the subjects of dialogue, the high energy of the field of interaction, which implies the expressiveness and validity of positions and parties, the deep precondition of dialogue with the degree of historical development of individuals, society, etc.). In psychological and pedagogical literature there are various approaches to the definition of criteria and indicators of the effectiveness and quality of the results of the educational process. In domestic studies, various criteria and indicators of the formation of activity components are presented in the works by O. A. Abdullina, V. A. Belikov, V. P. Bepalko, P. Ya. Halperin, V. A. Slaktionin, N. F. Talyzin, A. V. Usova, N. M. Yakovleva and other scholars. In theory and practice, there are general requirements for the isolation and justification of criteria that are reduced to the fact that they, firstly, must reflect the basic patterns of personality formation; secondly, to facilitate the establishment of links between all components of the problem under study; and thirdly, qualitative indicators should act in unity with quantitative ones.

In our study, the philosophical support for the development of the communicative competence of student youth is analyzed as qualitative indicators, and the levels are analyzed as quantitative characteristics depending on the choice of criteria.

In our work, we approve such a definition: the criterion is a sign on the basis of which the evaluation, checking tool, assessment measure are carried out.

The content of the concept of “criterion” is reflected in the works by V. I. Zagviatskiy. According to his research the criterion is a generalized indicator of the process development, of the activity success, which carries out the assessment of occurring events.

We take the works by G. M. Andreeva, A. A. Bodalev, B. F. Lomov, S. V. Petrushyn and other scholars as the basis of the development of criteria for the formation of communicative competence.

B. F. Lomov, investigating communicative competence as a process of providing poly-functional communication, distinguishes in its conceptual content such parts or functions as: “informational and communicative, covering the processes of reception and transmission of information; regulatory and communicative”, related to mutual correction of actions in the implementation of joint activities; “affective-communicative, belonging to the emotional sphere of a person and meets his needs in changing emotional state” (*Karelina A. A., and other, 2003*).

Thus, the first class of communication functions, informational and communicative, covers all those processes, which are described as “reception-transmission of information”. The second class of communication functions, regulatory and communicative, refers to the regulation of behavior. In the process of communication, an individual can influence the motive, purpose, program, decision-making, individual actions and their control, that is, all the “components” of the partner’s activities. In this process, mutual stimulation and mutual correction of behavior occur as well. The third class of communication functions, affective-communicative, relates to the emotional sphere of a person. According to B. F. Lomov, communication is the most important determinant of human emotional states. The entire spectrum of specifically human emotions arises in connection with the need to change their emotional state. Researcher B. F. Lomov points out at the same time that the functions of communication as a multidimensional process can be classified with another system of grounds (*Karelina A. A., and other, 2003*). However, in his work he does not offer the appropriate grounds.

A. A. Bodalev (based on V.N. Myasyshchev’s approach to the regularities and mechanisms of communication) proposed to highlight the importance of the study of a number of

components of communication, in particular the peculiarities of the cognitive processes of a person – “reflection”, his emotional spheres – “attitude” and behavior – “appeals” that arise in the process of communication.

Following A. A. Bodalev, S. V. Petrushyn, defining communicative competence (competence in communication) as a complex formation, introduces the cognitive, affective (emotional) and behavioral components (*Klymenko V. A., 2005*).

For the “cognitive” component we have chosen the most important informational and communicative criterion, which means the possession of a knowledge system for the exchange of information and knowledge of human beings in the process of professional communication.

The defining criterion of the “behavioral” component is regulatory and communicative, which means the ability to manage and make corrections to own behavior and behavior of other people, the organization of joint activities.

For the “emotional” component, we have chosen such a significant criterion as affective and communicative. Its essence is determined in relation to the emotional sphere of a person and in accordance with the needs for changing his emotional state.

The indicators of components are primarily those that can judge about the formation of communicative competence, the development of the student’s personality in the implementation of the prediction model and the implementation of pedagogical conditions.

Consequently, we defined the stages, objective indicators, criteria and levels of formation of communicative competence of future practical psychologists.

Today, student youth needs to be provided with the possibilities to acquire new knowledge independently, to generate new ideas, to quickly pass the stages of adaptation and to actively participate in the formation of their own personality. But the formation of high moral principles, guidelines and discipline is not enough to be strong in a concrete struggle in the labor market. As in informational society one of the central elements is information, the formation of information competence becomes one of the leading links for high-quality, high-speed work in the information environment.

We share the opinion of N. V. Balovsyak that an information-competent person knows how to find information, how to organize knowledge and how to use information in such a way that others can learn from it. This is a person trained for lifelong learning, since he can find the information needed to solve any problem (*Abramova I. T., and other, 2000*).

However, you can also find other meaningful delimitation of the concepts. Nowadays all the criteria offered by different authors are not connected in a single system and represent a certain set, in which many criteria are elaborated in detail, but it is not clear how they are interconnected.

I. D. Zvereva, L. G. Koval, P. D. Frolov point out that if the offered psychological criteria of moral education are taken for a certain set of criteria, then it can be settled according to the reproduced pattern.

With the help of this criterion, as a rule, we determine first of all a definite, most general property, inherent to one or another category, which combines a number of simple “indicators”. The same indicators can be detected due to a number of signs, that can be directly observed and subject to measurement.

We consider the criteria placed on the axis from the most generalized to the more specific. The most generalized criterion that needs to be specified is the life (public) position. According to the content characteristics, it is based on a system of criteria for a lower level of generalization (attitude towards people, labor, society, etc.), which, in relation to it, act as indicators. In turn, the definitions for each of the lower-level criteria can be characterized as more

“partial” criteria. Moreover, the “distinctive” ability of these criteria is different. If synthetic criteria (position, attitude) can somehow characterize moral education as a holistic psychological entity, then partial criteria (level of ethical knowledge, feelings, moral qualities, etc.) reflect only individual aspects of the psychological personality.

This can be explained by the fact that people were still looking for answers to the questions – what is the human purpose? which is the smallest common denominator of his activities? which is the dynamic (driving) principle of existence? In our opinion, if these answers were found, many answers to many other questions would inevitably arise. The establishment of this principle would have explained the phenomena of human behavior and made it possible to solve the basic problems of mankind. And most importantly, these results could be used in practice. All the factors necessary for the creation of the science of reason were found within the bounded universe, they were open, perceived, measured, tried on experience – and thus they became a scientific truth.

It is also worth bearing in mind that the components of a limited universe are time, space, energy and life.

It gives an opportunity to imagine that by analogy time, space, energy and life were born at some starting point and received an order to continue its existence, moving to an infinite destination. They were told nothing but what to do. They obey a single command, and this order is to survive (*L. Ron Hubbard, and other, 2004*). In our opinion, the purpose of life can be considered as endless survival.

L. Ron Hubbard believes that students as a form of life in all their actions and purposes obey the only order – to survive! According to the researcher, the fact that a person survives is not a new idea. The new thought is that man is driven by exclusively one idea – to survive (*L. Ron Hubbard, and other, 2004: 41–42*).

Methods of survival can be reduced to the following basic: nutrition, security (both protection and attack), as well as reproduction.

Consequently, there is no form of life in which there would be no solution to these problems. Any form of life makes mistakes, preserving for a long time any quality that can lead to its extinction (*L. Ron Hubbard, and other, 2004*).

It is well known that in philosophy there are two main ways of thinking and methods of knowledge: dialectics and metaphysics. On the one hand, the dialectics says that the world is in constant motion; the world is constantly moving and developing. Movement is any change at all. In our opinion, the most unique form of movement is social. On the other hand, metaphysics believes that the world is not interconnected, but recognizes the repetition and rejects the fact that everything is interconnected.

“Everything in the world is a moving necessity ...”, – said Leukkipp. According to L. Ron Hubbard, this is a key point in many theories that have arisen over many centuries. “Movement” is the key to the mistake. Everything is in motion. Necessity moves. Pain moves. Necessity and pain, pain and necessity (*L. Ron Hubbard, and other, 2004: 52–53*).

From the moment of its emergence, philosophy sought not only to comprehend a person in different realities, but also to formulate goals and ideas that predetermine the deployment of thoughts, priorities and principles that function as regulators, norms and rules of his behavior. The cardinal issues of philosophical support for the development of communicative-dialogic competence have recently been linked to the problem of increasing the volume of education as a way and result of gaining a person of culture.

In the opinion of Troitska O. M., in scientific researches of the last decades, it is impossible not to notice the accents emphasizing certain changes in the functioning of philosophy that

took place in connection with the approval of the postmodernist postulates as a new period in the development of culture, as the style of post-classical scientific thinking, which, in essence, content and hierarchy of values, positions itself with a sophist's departure from classical and non-classical philosophical reflection (*Troitska O. M., 2016*).

But, if we appeal to O. Leontiev's psychological concept of activity, it should be noted that communication (subject of activity), which, in our opinion, is a motive, is always caused by one or another need (*Andreeva G. M., 2006*).

Psychologists understand the motive (interests, ideals, orientation, values, beliefs) as the inner motivation of the individual to different kinds of activities (activity itself, communication, behavior) which are associated with the satisfaction of a particular need. On the basis of modern psychological ideas about motivation (V. K. Vylyunas, V. I. Koval, B. F. Lomov, K. K. Platonov, etc.), it is believed that the motivational sphere of the teacher and students consists of a set of stable motives, having a certain hierarchy and expressing the orientation of the person to the partner in communication and interaction.

This can be explained by the fact that between the natural abilities and the motivation there is a complex system of interconnection, and that under certain conditions the so-called compensatory mechanism may appear. We now conclude that if we move these ideas into effective pedagogical communication, one can argue that the lack of development of communicative abilities overlaps with the development of the motivational sphere by the student – the interest in the subject, the personality of the teacher, awareness of the importance and necessity of knowledge (*Andreeva G. M., 2006*).

Consequently, the philosophical support of the development of the communicative-dialogic competence of students in the cultural and educational space primarily involves the dialectic of communication, and in the indicated competence, it decisively motivates to choose the personality of the socio-cultural communicative sphere, where its subjective qualities will be sought and implemented. Undoubtedly, the choice will be determined by qualitative characteristics of the factors themselves. And first and foremost, it depends on the peculiarities of the social structure of society. However, it should be noted that this choice is always individual, since it represents a part of personal self-determination, finding the subject of his place in the socio-cultural system. The structure of the problem of choice can be represented by a set of key issues:

– To what extent the chosen socio-cultural environment will provide satisfaction for the development of communicative competence and personality needs, the disclosure and use of his potential?

– Does this choice facilitate the acquisition of the desired social status, reaching the sphere of social environment?

– How will this choice affect the change of lifestyle, since the latter is closely linked to a certain area of activity?

– To what extent will this choice determine the specific place of the individual in the system of communication in general? (*Istratova O. N., 2005*).

Of course, the problem of choice is objective data, and in the projection of philosophical comprehension and sociological vectors it should be noted that the problem of freedom of choice arises when it comes to its borders. In our case, it immediately turns out that the choice of the personality of the communication sphere is always associated with certain constraints. This can be explained by the fact that there are also subjective factors that prevent the selection of one or the same sphere of information interactions. This is due to the physical, psychological, intellectual, volitional human potentials that extend or narrow the range of development of his communicative potentials (*Istratova O. N., 2005*).

As you know, in the social psychology the definition of communication competence does not exist. But in ontogenesis and phylogeny, speaking about the individual development of the human body and his interaction with society, we consider communicative competence as communicative-dialogic competence, because, in our opinion, communication cannot exist without dialogue, as an individual cannot exist outside the society. In practical psychology, the communicative competence of a person determines the effectiveness of his inclusion in the processes of socio-cultural communication, acting as a necessary and sufficient condition for actualization and implementation of various functions of culture in society by the subject.

It can be represented in the form developed by A. Ya. Flier in relation to the formation of the cultural polysubjectivity of the individual in the process of his socialization:

- Competence in relation to the institutional norms of social organization and regulation – the main social institutions, economic, political, legal and confessional structures, institutions, customs and hierarchies;
- Competence in relation to the conventions of social regulation – national and class traditions, dominant morality, morality, worldview, values, appraisal criteria, norms of ethics, customs, rituals, daily erudition in natural, technical, social and humanitarian knowledge;
- Competence in relation to short-term, but acutely actual images of social prestige – fashion, image, style, jargon, idols, gender symbols, intellectual and aesthetic currents;
- Competence in relation to the level of completeness and fluency in the languages of social communication – natural spoken (oral and written), special languages and social (professional), jargon, used in this community by etiquette and ceremonial, political, religious, social and ethnographic symbolism, attribute of prestige, social marking of style, fashion, etc (*Istratova O. N., 2005*).

So we come to the conclusion that with the help of translation and consolidation of these components of communication competence in the culture of each next generation there is a social reproduction of society and its culture.

Motivation as the main factor in regulating the individual's activity, his communication, dialogue, behavior and activity is important. Communication (subject of activity), which is a motive, always occurs due to the need of a person.

Along with this, as O. M. Korets notes, it is necessary to distinguish between own competence and its realization. If competence is the acquired or intuitive knowledge of the language system, the possession of an effective communication technique, the implementation of competence implies the ability to use this knowledge in the communication process. Therefore, in the opinion of the researcher, the essence of communicative competence lies in the aggregate of ideas about ways and means of ensuring interaction in the process of communication, in the implementation of the chosen communicative position, as well as in achieving communicative goals by means of the language (*Klymenko V. A., 2005*).

The well-known philosopher M. Kagan theoretically distinguishes the following activities: transformative, cognitive, value-orientation, communicative (or communication). Without a purpose to give a detailed description of each activity, we will find out the key objects of activity that are important: nature; society; personality; "I"-image. All types and objects of activity are interconnected in different forms: coupling, crossing, interaction, etc. Consequently, all activities can be autonomous, but the realization of each of them is possible only under the conditions of promotion of other types. It is proved that artistic mastery of the world by a human is possible in the conditions of the realization of above mentioned four types of activities. There is a "merger" of all types of activities in art, the result of which is the modification of each activity, because any type of activity must "adapt", coincide with the other three. Using the scheme of a

closed system of four types of activities proposed by M. S. Kagan, we will define some of our conceptual views on the structure of artistic activity and its components:

- transformative activity;
- cognitive activity;
- value-orientation activity;
- communicative activities;
- artistic activity;
- artistic creativity.

As the scheme shows, in the given quadrilateral there are reciprocal links and interconnection lines. The analysis of literature in this context proves that in art there is a very interesting, at first glance, phenomenon – an organic combination, a complete coincidence of the main types of activities, the result of which is the fifth type, which has an organic integrity and does not decompose into constituent components.

In general, it is very difficult to assess the creative contribution to the development of world philosophy of representatives of various philosophical and other domains of knowledge, since there is always a certain danger not to notice this or that important idea. That is why it is necessary to define the above-stated ideas, to outline their significance and value.

As a result, we argue that communicative-dialogic competence acts as a hierarchically organized mental entity, as a certain level of development of the individual, which involves the formation of his integral system of motivational-inductive, personal qualities and functional-operational manifestations that realize the emotional, cognitive and behavioral components of the sphere of personality.

The philosophy of communicative space as a complex multicomponent structure is considered in connection with the search for effective means of constructing the interaction, knowledge and skills in the system of interpersonal relations, which are related to the mutual exchange of information and knowledge of people of each other, with the management of their own behavior and behavior of others and with the organization of activities.

Accordingly, the development of communicative-dialogic competence of student youth in the cultural and educational space during higher education involves the development of the ability to flexibly determine positions and choose roles in different systems of interaction, to adequately act in appropriate situations.

O. Troitska points out that in order for the dialogue to correspond to the situation of creating a current state, one should develop the skills of a certain psychological readiness for the perception and attitude of the dialogue partners. Moreover, the dialogue requires the most complex process from the person-recognition of the value of the position of each participant in the dialogue, which is made up of the differences from their own. However, not every person has such readiness and desire (*Troitska O. M., 2016: 31*).

The idea of the dialogue of thinking and its dialogic structure are deepened and developed in the works of psychologists G. Kuchinsky, B. Lomov, O. Matyushkin, O. Samoilov. Imaginary orientation to another person as a self-assessor of his own activities is the starting point for the performance of a mental act. Such inclusion of another person is related to the need for social testing of the (new) results obtained, psychological preconditions that take the form of addressing an imaginary or real interlocutor. The results of experimental studies by O. Matyushkin confirmed the idea that the scheme of real human thinking corresponds to the structure of dialogue, the unit of which is “question-answer” (*Troitska O. M., 2016: 31 – 32*). G. Kuchinsky’s research on the role of dialogue in thought suggests that the more complex the mental process, especially if it needs to be productive and creative, the more complex the dialogue is, such activities include it as a compulsory component (*Troitska O. M., 2016: 32*).

4. Conclusion

So, in general, we can state that the changes that are taking place in the domestic higher education during the reform are of a systemic nature. Covering all levels of the academic vertical, they also affect the structuring of the educational paradigm, and the organization of the learning process, its content and target priorities. The implementation of foreign, in particular European, experience, plays an important role. But we should remember H. Ortega-y-Hasset's warning: "... in a foreign country it is worth looking for information, but not models ...". Therefore, the transformation of the educational paradigm must be accompanied by a serious scientific reflection on the correlation of Western traditions, models and conventions with those socio-cultural and geopolitical challenges that have arisen today in front of the Ukrainian student youth in the cultural and educational space.

References

- Abramova I. T. (2000). *Vozrastnaya psihologiya. [Age psychology.]* – Moscow: Moscow Psychological and Social Institute. [in Russian]
- Abstract of dissertation: Konovalenko T. V. (2006). *Rozvytok vyrazno-komunikatyvnykh navychok maibutnykh uchyteliv. [Development of expressive-communicative skills of future teachers].* Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]
- Andreeva G. M. (2006). *Sotsialna psikhologia: ucheb. Posobie dlia studentov VUZov. [Social psychology: handbook for college students]* – Moscow: Aspect Press. [in Russian]
- Artemchuk O. G. (2010). *Rozvytok tvorchodo potentsialu maibutnykh praktychnykh psykholodiv. [Development of creative potential of future practical psychologists]* – Kyiv: Lybid. [in Ukrainian]
- Istratova O. N. (2005). *Psikhodiagnostika: kolleksia luchshykh testov: Psikhologicheski praktikum. [Psychodiagnosics: a collection of the best tests: Psychological Practice]* – Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix. [in Russian]
- Klymenko V. A. (2005). *Metodychnyi analiz poniattia "psykhychnyi rozvytok kiudyny". [Methodological analysis of the concept of "human mental development"]*. Retrieved from http://www.bdpu.org/scientific_published/psychology_1_2005/1. [in Ukrainian]
- Karelina A. A. (2003). *Psikhologicheskie testy (Tom 1). [Psychological tests (Vols 1)]* – Moscow: Gumanit. ed. center VLADOS. (in Russian)
- Mishchuk I. M. (2007) *Skladovi komunikativnoi kompetentsii (Tekst) // Novi tekhnologii navchannia [Vyp. 46]. [Components of communicative competence (Text) // New learning technologies [Ed. 46].* – Kyiv: Publishing House of the Institute of Innovative Technologies and Educational Content. (in Ukrainian)
- Taranenko I. M. (1996). *Kompetentnisty – vumoga suchasnosti. [Competence – the requirement of modernity]* Kiev: Svitlo: № 1. (in Ukrainian)
- Troitska O. M. (2016). *Dialog i tolerantnisty u kulturno-osvitynomu prostori vyshchoi shkoly (Monografia). [Dialogue and tolerance in the cultural and educational space of higher school (Monograph)]* – Melitopol: Ed. of B. Khmelnytskyi MDP. (in Ukrainian)
- Formanovskaya N. I. (2009). *Rechevoi yetiket i kultura obshcheniia. [Speech etiquette and culture of communication]* – St. Petersburg: Piter. (in Russian)
- L. Ron Hubbard (2004). *Dianetika – sovremennaia nauka o razume. [Dianetics – contemporary science about mind]* – Moscow: New-era (in Russian)