



DOI: 10.54919/physics/55.2024.23hy2

## Pedagogical dialogue as a function of social-cultural development: Case of Kazakhstan

**Zhuldyz Alibayeva\***

PhD, Teacher-Researcher

Pavlodar Pedagogical University named after A. Margulan

140000, 60 Mir Str., Pavlodar, Republic of Kazakhstan

**Zhuldyz Abisheva**

Senior Lecturer

Shakarim University of Semey

070000, 20A Glinka Str., Semey, Republic of Kazakhstan

**Saltanat Akhtanova**

PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University

010008, 2 Satpayev Str., Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan

**Karlygash Koishybayeva**

PhD Student

Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University

120000, 29A Aiteke Bi Str., Kyzylorda, Republic of Kazakhstan

**Mukhtar Bekturganov**

Head of the Department

National Defense University of the Republic of Kazakhstan

020000, 72 Turan Ave., Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan

### Abstract

**Relevance.** The organization of dialogue interaction is relevant at the initial stage of study at the university, as the dialogue creates the basis for respectful and friendly relations between students, promotes fruitful cooperation of all subjects of educational processes.

**Purpose.** The purpose of the article is to explore the importance of dialogue in the socio-cultural development of the individual.

**Methodology.** The methodological basis for solving this scientific problem is the theoretical foundations of the system-activity approach. The fundamental point of the study is the methodological basis of the research proposal - the study of the functions of dialogue.

**Results.** The result of this study showed that for effective cooperation with other people in various activities, the successful assimilation of universal human values and norms of behavior, a student must have a culture of dialogue. The formation of a culture-dialogue is one of the directions for realizing the tasks of socio-cultural development.

### Suggested Citation:

Alibayeva Zh, Abisheva Zh, Akhtanova S, Koishybayeva K, Bekturganov M. Pedagogical dialogue as a function of social-cultural development: Case of Kazakhstan. *Sci Herald Uzhhorod Univ Ser Phys.* 2024;(55):232–243. DOI: 10.54919/physics/55.2024.23hy2

\*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

**Conclusions.** The culture of dialogue involves the adoption of oneself and the other with attitudes of moral and humanistic values, contributes to the development of the individual and society as a whole.

**Keywords:** students; norms of behavior; moral values; development; education

## Introduction

In modern Kazakhstani society socio-economic, socio-cultural transformations are taking place. At present, society has reached a level of understanding that: “the success of both political and economic modernization depends primarily on the level of public consciousness, where dialogue is a priority. The socio-economic and socio-cultural changes taking place in modern society have exacerbated the problem of human relations: increasingly, people do not understand each other, and the number of conflict situations is increasing. These changes especially affect such a social group as youth, which is characterized by maximalism, change and distortion of value orientations, independence and a simple, sometimes rash, solution to any problems. Therefore, the socio-cultural development of the person becomes of great importance and relevance in such a difficult period.

The current sociocultural situation of Kazakhstani reality, puts forward the requirement of unity and diversity in worldviews, and suggests fundamentally different approaches to pedagogical dialogue. The problem of turning to dialogue is crucial for the current sociocultural situation and is associated with the transition of a person to existence in a situation of uncertainty and the development of his own subjectivity. Trends in education towards diversity: alternative educational orientations, author's pedagogical practices, the transition to the “subject-subject” paradigm of education and the emergence of many and different subjects and their meanings in this connection allow us to consider education as a multicultural educational space. The problems of such a transition are due to the emergence of many irreducible meanings, subjects of meaning-forming activity and the need to co-organize each with a different one. This generates an appeal to dialogue as a way of solving the problems of meaning formation and actualizes the sociocultural functions of the dialogue: to identify, realize and organize different things [1].

Socio-cultural development is a continuous process of assimilation of a person of social norms and cultural values, aimed at the transformation of its individual qualities. The main goal of personality development is self-determination, self-affirmation, self-realization in various types of activity: cognitive, communicative, aesthetic, spiritual, value-orientational. Achieving this goal is impossible without interaction and communication with subjects, the educational process and social groups. Dialogue has great potential for the socio-cultural development of the individual. The organization of dialogue interaction is especially relevant at the initial stage of study at the university, as the dialogue creates the basis for respectful and friendly relations between students, promotes fruitful cooperation of all subjects of educational and educational processes.

The analysis of scientific knowledge showed that for effective cooperation with other people in various activities, the successful assimilation of universal human values and norms of behavior, a person, and in the authors’

case a student, must have a culture of dialogue. Consequently, the formation of a culture-dialogue is one of the directions for realizing the tasks of socio-cultural development. An important component of its socio-cultural development, as it contributes to self-determination and self-actualization of personality in the context of culture. The culture of dialogue involves the adoption of oneself and the other with attitudes of moral and humanistic values, contributes to the development of the individual and society as a whole [2].

The purpose of the article was to explore the importance of dialogue in the socio-cultural development of a person.

## Literature Review

The desired problem is considered semi-scientific and multi-aspect. This is evidenced by a review of the literature. The concept of dialogue in relation to culture arose in the research studies of K. Jaspers [3] and J. Han *et al.* [4]. K. Jaspers [3] elevated the ability to communicate to the rank of “epistemological criterion of truth”, J. Han *et al.* [4] transferred the concept of “dialogue” from the literary genre to the philosophical category. J. Yuan [5] noted that culture is acquired in interpersonal relationships and includes value, symbolic, and institutional components. In fact, this approach is due to an attempt to comprehend culture within the framework of the postmodern paradigm and provides an understanding of the objective basis of dialogism inherent in the deep meanings of culture.

According to the P.B. Seitkazy *et al.* [6], dialogue approach in education is designed to provide an understanding of the whole integrity of life, the assimilation of cultural achievements accumulated by mankind. Awareness of the value, patterns of development of nature and society, acquired skills of various types of activities, including pedagogical, creative. In the aspect of this approach, the functions of culture are correlated with the functions of education and they are considered as close in meaning. R. Cui & P. Teo [7] note that dialogue is an opportunity for individual perception of life. It reveals a multi-color palette of human's originality – and this is the main advantage of dialogue. G.R. Jackson [8] sees in the dialogue the possibility of overcoming the contradictions that arise in the educational process, emphasizes its universality, its “extrajudiciality” and “incompleteness” – the entire life of the educational process should be permeated with dialogical relations.

A. Elias & A. Mansouri [9] emphasize the great importance of dialogue, considering that in the conditions of mutual spiritual communication there is a deep awareness of a different culture and a different human experience. The authors examined that spiritual egoism and false beliefs that only one's own culture is the only valuable thing are collapsing. But this requires not a dialogue of the deaf, but mutual obedience and mutual trust. J. Kapfere [10] believes that the basis of the dialogue is: the excitement of the already existing in the human soul.

According to A.M. Zubarev [11], understanding acts as a property of the dialogue, connected not only with the personal characteristics of the speaker: born in the response, it becomes evidence of a certain evaluative attitude to what was said, to the remark of another. B. Geurts [12] considers dialogue as a tool for personal improvement. Violations of this tool can lead to mental disorders, as well as to a decrease in the individual's adaptive capabilities.

In modern science, special attention is paid to the humanistic ideas of individual freedom, its self-determination, the ability to make informed choices is emphasized. L. Vaschenko [13] correlates personality development with movement not only to the ability to listen and understand other points of view, but also to the ability to enter into dialogue with them. In this case, the emphasis is not on upholding one's opinion, but on opening oneself to many other views. Analysis of the psychological literature has shown that there are many psychological studies related to the study of the problem to varying degrees. V. Manca [14] defines dialogue as a special way of thinking. She believes that dialogicality as a characteristic of thinking has been lost by modern psychologists, but variation and alternativeness are unthinkable without dialogue.

F.L. Vinella *et al.* [15] considered dialogue as a form of psychological influence in his research. Dialogical communication is the most radical way to organize productive contacts between one person and another. In psychological terms, this level is characterized by full mutual understanding of partners in communication with each other, a positive emotional tone of their relationship, suggesting the need and possibility of mutual disclosure. M.J. Pickering & S. Garrod [16] emphasized that the main point in the content of the dialogue is the interaction of the points of view developed by the interlocutors that is, expressed in the system of definitions of semantic positions, subjects about the topic of the dialogue as the main defined one. Dialogue is not only an exchange of replicas, opinions, and information; it involves the opposite of personal positions with a focus on mutual understanding and cooperation.

Psychologist P. Grice [17] explores meaningful dialogue, that is, dialogue without the inappropriate remarks of partners. He considers the existence of a common goal an important characteristic of such a dialogue. But he does not specify the purpose of the dialogue. He believes that the goal sets the direction for the joint discussion that it can be present initially, or can be worked out directly during the conversation, that it can be as clear and unusually vague as possible or takes on all sorts of intermediate meanings. The direction of the dialogue sometimes undergoes certain changes by mutual agreement of partners, and this is permissible as long as there is a willingness to cooperate in speech actions. If, at least at some moments, the conversation was purposeful, we apply the principle of cooperation to it. P. Grice [17] has also developed four principles of dialogue that speakers generally adhere to in order to optimize communication:

- the principle of quantity – not to provide too much (but not too little) information;
- principle of quality – not to say what is obviously a lie, to be sincere;

- principle of correlation – to speak on business;
- the principle of manners – to speak clearly, concisely and clearly.

Dialogue researchers highlight the following fundamental principles. Firstly, a dialogue can only be realized if there is a dialogic relationship. Secondly, dialogue is a form of subject-subject relations in which different semantic positions are developed by different speakers (external dialogue) or one speaker (internal dialogue). Thirdly, the dialogue is due to the presence of some objective judgments about the subject of dialogue in unity with an evaluative personal attitude to it. To enter into a dialogical position means to express not only the objective thought itself, but also somehow relate to it.

## Materials and Methods

The methodological basis for solving this scientific problem is constituted by the theoretical principles of the system-active approach. The fundamental point of the current study is the methodological basis of the research proposal is the study of the functions of dialogue. The identification of problems makes it possible to appeal to dialogue and the functions of dialogue themselves as activity formations. The basis of the study was the socio-cultural development of students and the ideas of systemic, personal, active, multi-subject, cultural and sociocultural approaches. In the framework of a systematic approach, the process of socio-cultural development of students is considered as a system, taking into account the specifics of the interaction of all subjects of the educational process. This approach makes it possible to weigh comprehensively all-factors in determining the goals of ensuring the process of socio-cultural development and direct all funds to achieve them.

The personal approach allows you to orient the process of providing social and cultural development to the individual as a goal, subject, result and criterion of its effectiveness. It implies the creation of conditions for the creative development of the personality, and also focuses on the uniqueness of each person, its intellectual freedom in the process of socio-cultural development. An activity-based approach allows us to consider the process of socio-cultural development of students in the context of pedagogical dialogue as a special work on the selection and organization of student activity aimed at creating a dialogue culture, a culture of behavior and a culture of appearance. This approach activates the subjective position of the student in the educational process. A multisubject, or dialogical approach creates the opportunity to consider the formation of personality not only in activity, but also in communication. This approach is fundamental to the authors' study, since the process of socio-cultural development of students is carried out directly in communication and through communication.

In the framework of the cultural approach, we consider the process of socio-cultural development from a position of value. As a result of this process, students not only develop in the course of mastering the culture of dialogue, the culture of behavior and the culture of appearance, but also bring something new to them. The essence of the sociocultural approach for this research is to organize education as a general cultural phenomenon, as well as to

ensure the teacher's activity aimed at helping students to reproduce socially significant interactions.

The materials in this article are systematized and designed based on the use of the following research methods: questionnaires, observation, comparative analysis and generalization; qualitative analysis of products of activity, design of joint activities. The methods of analysis and generalization made it possible to represent the phenomenon of dialogue and revealed the nature of dialogical interaction and the conditions for its implementation. An analysis of scientific knowledge has allowed us to come to understand the socio-cultural development of students as a continuous process of assimilation of social norms and cultural values, taking into account the resource potential of the individual, aimed at transforming her individual qualities. Moreover, taking into account the specific features of the problem, we developed a special technique based on the psycholinguistic approach to the analysis of texts of participants in joint activities. This method allows the sense formation generated in the process and considered as a product of the meaning-forming activity and the implementation of the pedagogical functions of the dialogue.

Pilot work in order to test the model of socio-cultural development of students in the process of pedagogical dialogue of the subjects of the educational process was carried out on the basis of specialties of education on the basis of Pavlodar Pedagogical University named after A. Margulan. The experiment took place in three stages: summative, formative and control. The summative stage involved the solution of the following objectives:

- diagnosis of the resource fund;
- identification of the level of socio-cultural development of students;
- determining the motivation of students to study the disciplines of the general humanitarian cycle.

Diagnostics involved an analysis of the existing potential of the disciplines taught at the university to achieve their goals. During this process, we analyzed education standards of specialties for the training of teachers and educational programs, as well as the potential of general humanitarian disciplines for the implementation of the process of socio-cultural development of students.

At a summative stage, the experimental and control groups of students were distinguished and a study was conducted aimed at identifying the level of their socio-cultural development.

In accordance with the ideas about the socio-cultural development of students, its components were distinguished: a culture of dialogue, a culture of behavior and a culture of appearance. The level of formation of these components indicates the level of socio-cultural development of students as a whole. The culture of dialogue also includes the following indicators:

- dialogical knowledge (knowledge about the essence of the dialogue culture, typology, stages, styles, levels, functions, structure, conditions of the dialogue and its forms, about the technique of dialogue);
- dialogical skills (the ability to initiate and conduct dialogue, build communication on the basis of humanism, maintain a climate favorable for dialogue interaction);
- a value attitude to dialogue (interest in dialogic interaction, motivation to develop dialogic communication with others, awareness of the values of dialogue and communication in general, the place and role of dialogue in the life of a modern person and professional activity, value attitude to the interlocutor's personality and opinion);
- openness to cooperation (readiness to organize creative interaction with a small and large group of people, active participation in joint activities, leadership in achieving a common goal);
- tolerance (the manifestation of a respectful attitude to the person of the interlocutor, his opinion and products of activity, the ability to balance external and internal personal manifestations).

The average score was compared with the level characteristics of indicators and criteria

1. Level characteristics in terms of "dialogic knowledge". Criteria: knowledge of dialogue techniques, the use of speech cliches (Table 1).

2. Level characteristics in terms of "dialogue skills". Criteria: ability to conduct a dialogue, ability to maintain a friendly climate (Table 2).

3. Level characteristics in terms of value-based indicators. Criteria: interest in the person of the interlocutor, interest in the dialogue (Table 3).

**Table 1.** Level characteristics in terms of "dialogic knowledge"

Level	Characteristics
High (6 points)	Dialogue knowledge is well formed; The dialogue is informative; Good knowledge of dialogue techniques and behavioral strategies in difficult situations; Appropriate choice of speech cliches
Average (5-3 points)	Dialogical knowledge is well formed; Desire for meaningful dialogue; Good knowledge of dialogue and ways to overcome difficulties, but tactics are not always chosen correctly; Speech cliches are not always used
Low (2 points)	The knowledge of dialogue is scarce or absent; Communication is primitive; Speech cliches do not apply

**Source:** compiled by the authors

**Table 2.** Level characteristics in terms of "dialogue skills"



Level	Characteristics
High (6 points)	Ability to conduct dialogue in various communication situations; Ability to initiate and maintain dialogue; Friendly interaction is characteristic
Average (5-3 points)	The ability to initiate dialogical interaction, but not to support it; Communication is partnership in most situations
Low (2 points)	The ability to start, support and complete the dialogue is absent; Authoritarian style of communication

**Table 3.** Level characteristics in terms of value-based indicators

Level	Characteristics
High (6 points)	The value of dialogue is clearly recognized; Interest is shown in the interlocutor and his opinion; Sustainable motivation for dialogue interaction
Average (5-3 points)	The value of dialogue is recognized, but interest in it is situational; In most cases, supports attention to the interlocutor; motivation is based only on a personal position
Low (2 points)	Lack of value attitude to both the dialogue and the opinion of the interlocutor; Positive motivation for dialogue interaction does not appear

Depending on the degree of manifestation of these components, three levels of socio-cultural development of students are distinguished: high, medium, low. A high level of socio-cultural development is characterized by deep knowledge about the culture of dialogue, the ability to conduct dialogue based on semantic content, awareness of the social significance of dialogic communication, the partner style of interaction, a tolerant attitude to the person of the interlocutor, his point of view and products of activity, as well as the ability to correctly and culturally behave in various situations, observing the dress code. The average level of socio-cultural development is characterized by good knowledge of the technique of dialogue, the ability to maintain dialogue on the basis of one's own interests, understanding the need for dialogue in the classroom, a friendly communication style, respectful attitude of others, and also knowledge of the basic rules of conduct in public places and requirements to the student's appearance. The low level of socio-cultural development is characterized by meager knowledge of dialogue and its specifics, insufficient development of dialogical skills, lack of a value-based attitude to dialogue, an authoritarian style of interaction, and rejection of other points of view; as well as the lack of knowledge about the rules of behavior (etiquette) in various situations and partial observance of the culture of appearance.

Determining the components of socio-cultural development, indicators and levels, we are aware that they are relative to a certain extent, since there are, of course, other components. Nevertheless, the components that we identified on the basis of analysis of philosophical, psychological and pedagogical literature and the authors' experience, in the authors' opinion, reflect the real process of training and education in a higher educational institution, as well as the process of socio-cultural development in the first year. These components will be used during the ascertaining, forming control stages of the experiment.

The determination of the components of socio-cultural development made it possible to compile and select a series of questionnaires, tests, and standardized diagnostic methods. To identify the level of formation of a dialogue

culture, we carried out a diagnosis of its indicators: dialogic knowledge and skills, value attitude to dialogue, etc. In order to identify dialogical knowledge and skills, a questionnaire was developed which contained 10 questions that were aimed at identifying dialogical knowledge and dialogical skills.

To ensure effective socio-cultural development of students in the formative the stage of this study the following socio-pedagogical, personality-communicative and organizational-activity conditions were taken into account. Among the socio-pedagogical we highlighted the observance of the principles of dialogue and norms of behavior, the relationship of educational, cognitive and communicative activities, the unity of theory and practice, and a differentiated approach. When organizing dialogs in practical classes, we followed such principles as activity, openness, individuality and collectivity, independence, problematic. The second condition was realized through the formation of a value attitude to the components of socio-cultural development, the active participation of each student and the change of roles in dialogue activity, ensuring freedom for students in independent work and evaluating results.

At the formative stage, the author program was implemented in the experimental group; aimed at the socio-cultural development of freshmen. In the control group, training took place in traditional conditions without the introduction of a program. It is important to note that we did not: special selection of students in: experimental and control groups. In an experiment regular student group formed by the dean's participated and this allowed to be held; natural experiment. To ensure effective socio-cultural development of students in the formative stage of the authors' research, the following socio-pedagogical, personality-communicative and organizational-activity conditions were taken into account.

Among the socio-pedagogical we highlighted the observance of the principles of dialogue and norms of behavior, the relationship of educational, cognitive and communicative activities, the unity of theory; And practice, a differentiated approach to students; teacher demonstration of culture, dialogue, culture of behavior-

and appearance. When organizing dialogs in practical classes, we followed such principles as activity, openness, individuality and collectivity, and independence. The unity of theory and practice was an important condition for creating a dialogue environment due to the fact that providing students with dialogical knowledge contributed to the transformation of communicative behavior into a conscious process. The results of the formation of a culture of dialogue turned out to be higher in those cases when practical training was preceded by theoretical training.

The application of a differentiated approach was due to individual differences in those qualities and conditions of students; on which the result of the educational process depended. These included the level of knowledge, skills and abilities, as well as properties that temporarily or constantly affect students. Taking into account such differences made it possible to adequately distribute the workload, and this, in turn, created a comfortable environment for students. Almost at each lesson there were one or two students who could not organize themselves to participate in the dialogue, so the teacher unobtrusively initiated their inclusion in the general activity. The role of the teacher in creating the conditions for the socio-cultural development of students was decisive. By his attitude, behavior and speech, he tried to show a role model. The demonstration of such behavior stimulated the students' desire to meet a high level of socio-cultural development, and provided a friendly atmosphere in the classroom, conducive to dialogue interaction and cooperation.

Among the personal and communicative conditions, we attributed the formation of motivation to mastering the components of socio-cultural development, focus on creative self-realization in dialogue, the desire for self-development in order to overcome the difficulties of communication and behavior. The formation of motivation was carried out through the awakening of interest in ongoing activities. For this, various situations were created where everyone could prove themselves and their knowledge, material was selected that affected the senses and activated thought processes. Self-realization was determined by the dual position of the student in the dialogue: he was aware of himself both as a subject (an equal participant in the dialogue) and an object (for whom the dialogue was created). The success of the application of a dialogue was evidenced by personal expression and increased efficiency.

Determination of the difficulties of communication and the behavior that students encountered at the initial stage of university education led to the development of ways to overcome them and actualize their own potential. Among the organizational and activity conditions, we highlighted the definition of the content of dialogue, the systematic application of various types of dialogical interaction, the establishment of subjective-subjective relations, monitoring the process of socio-cultural development and making changes to improve it. The tasks of the formative stage of the authors' research:

- educational, forming the necessary knowledge, skills and values;
- psychological, consisting in the formation of motivation and willingness to master the components of socio-cultural development;

- didactic, focused on the use of such techniques and strategies that would allow us to successfully formulate and enhance a culture of dialogue, a culture of behavior and a culture of appearance in the student environment;

- educational, its essence is the ability to improve their skills and transfer their knowledge to others.

During the formative experiment, a number of related tasks were solved:

- formation and support of motivation to learn a foreign language;
- increasing the level of linguistic knowledge;
- actualization of pair and group work in practical classes.

The solution of the tasks was carried out in the following ways:

- informing students about the essence of the phenomenon under study;

- application of the possibilities of the discipline "Foreign language" to improve the level of dialogue culture and behavior culture;

- providing students with the necessary knowledge and skills when faced with difficulties that impede socio-cultural development;

- supporting students independent work, contributing to the disclosure of their internal potential;

- development and implementation of a set of tasks to increase the level of socio-cultural development of students.

The basis of the program of socio-cultural development of students was a special course "On the path to dialogue communication". This course included the necessary theoretical material on the culture of dialogue, the culture of behavior and the culture of appearance, as well as practical tasks aimed at the formation, development and improvement of dialogue skills and cultural behavior. The vocabulary of each section of the special course corresponded to the material studied, according to the thematic plan for the discipline "English language". The theoretical part included the following information: types, forms, functions and stages of dialogue, types of questions, in a dialogue, rules for drawing up interrogative sentences, styles of dialogue interaction, types of conflict resolution, features of communicative behavior, rules for dialogue, the role of intonation, speech etiquette, ways of understanding, perception errors, methods for adjusting dialogue, communication barriers, rules of conduct in various types of dialogical interaction and in public places, the main provisions of the dress code.

## **Results**

Analytical work showed that a university graduate should have a certain set of general cultural competencies. From the point of view of the authors' study, the most important are:

- the ability to logically true, build reasoned and clear oral and written speech;
- the willingness to cooperate with colleagues, work in a team;
- the ability to critically evaluate personal strengths and weaknesses;

- the ability to carry out business communication: public speaking, negotiations, meetings, electronic communication;
- the ability to adhere to ethical values;
- own a culture of thinking, the ability to perceive, generalize and analyze information, set goals and choose ways to achieve it.

In general, we can say that the development of the sociocultural component of the student's personality, ensuring effective professional activity and communication, is one of the central areas of education. After analyzing the curricula and plans of disciplines of the general humanitarian cycle, we came to the conclusion that the study of a foreign language has a special potential for influencing the socio-cultural development of students. This discipline can help students orient themselves towards a culture of dialogue, behavior and appearance through a combination of mandatory and variable components: the active use of the second in the theoretical section of the program.

A generalized analysis of the results by the level of formation of a culture of dialogue, a culture of behavior and a culture of appearance showed that at the beginning of the study, students are dominated by medium (40% of students in the experimental group and 43.8% of students in the control group) and low (55.6% of students in the experimental group and 50.2% of students; in the control group) the level of socio-cultural development. A high level of socio-cultural development was found in 4.4% of students in the experimental group and 6% in the control group. This indicates that:

- students have a minimum of knowledge about the culture of dialogue;
- in situations of dialogical interaction, they often try to find the simplest, way to respond, but not the most effective, which would stimulate the development of dialogue;
- they can listen to someone else's opinion, but they do not always correctly evaluate it, giving free rein to feelings and temper, often judge a person, not a point of view;
- participate in collective activities willingly, but more often with personal gain, without support and help to their partners;
- do not consider that the appearance should be appropriate for the situation.

This indicates a contradiction between the potential for increasing the level of socio-cultural development of freshmen, and their lack of a complete picture of this phenomenon. In this regard, it becomes necessary to implement a program that promotes the socio-cultural development of students. The personal attitude to learning performs a system-forming function in the structure of motivation for learning activities. The way a student relates to the phenomenon being studied characterizes the level of his motivation. Interest is the key to assimilation and consolidation of knowledge. Motivation includes needs, interests, values, and attitudes that encourage a student to master knowledge, consciously relate to the educational process, show zeal and initiative in educational activities.

The analysis of the role of the above-mentioned conditions, the methods, forms and means used that affect

the process of socio-cultural development of students, showed the significance of each of them. The success of the developed model of socio-cultural development of first-year students during the organization of the pedagogical dialogue of the subjects of the educational process was evaluated by the results of the student's final diagnosis and the change of roles in dialogue activity, ensuring freedom for students to work independently and evaluate results. We came to the conclusion that the dialogue acts as a unique tool of pedagogical support, socio-cultural development of the personality of the student, future specialist. Such support is especially important at such moments when he is faced with problems – choice of life priorities, lines; behavior-when- he draws conclusions from his own experience. In other words, the pedagogical dialogue is emotionally aesthetically oriented, it motivates the adoption and justification of one or another “style of behavior: and student activity, and stimulates activity to open one's own; meanings and values, mobilizes forces for quick completion of tasks. In preparing for classes, we took into account the fact that, to stimulate the dialogue; it is obligatory in advance: problematic, inconsistent; opportunity: evaluations, questioning, the ability to express an opinion for each dialogue partner.

It was found that 42.7% of students in the experimental group and 41.3% of students in the control group have an average level of dialogic knowledge about the culture of dialogue: they highlight some of its characteristics. This was evidenced by such answers as “patiently listen to the interlocutor”, “lucidly express your thoughts and emotions”, “the ability to speak and listen to another”, “pleasant and respectful communication”, “understanding what the interlocutor is talking about”, etc.

To the question: “Do you think you have a culture of dialogue?” 7.6% of students in the experimental group answered positively and 11% of students in the control group. An analysis of the answers to the question: “What rules of speech etiquette do you know?” We could conclude that students' understanding of speech etiquette comes down to only being polite, not interrupting and not using obscene words, that is, these answers do not reflect the essence of the described phenomena in full. 48.4% of students in the experimental group and 41.9% of students in the control group left the question: “What types of dialogs do you know?” unanswered. Analysis of the proposed options for types of dialogue showed that students consider dialogue at the household level. 72% of students in the experimental group and 65.8% of students in the control group answered the question “Do you have any difficulties in communication?” positively. They cited the following as examples: “I cannot always express my thoughts quite clearly and expressively”, “reluctance to talk with unpleasant people”, “boring to listen to others”, “vocabulary is small”, “excitement and shyness in a new environment”, “I don't know how to start a conversation”.

So, a generalized analysis of students' questionnaires showed that students have an average (35.05% of students in the experimental group and 36.15% of students in the control group) and: low (64.95% of students in the experimental group and 63.85% of students in the control group) – level of dialogic knowledge and skills. They “have general ideas about the content of the phenomenon



of “culture of dialogue” and do not comply with the rules of dialogue.

To determine the students' attitude to the culture of dialogue, we used the methodology of the associative series. We got the following results: 66.9% of students of the experimental group and 70.3% of students in the control group the attitude towards dialogue is consumer and negative. This is evidenced by such associations as “insisting on one's own”, “SMS”, “service”, “street”, “harm”, and “anger”. This method also made it possible to identify students whose dialogue evokes positive emotions; they represent its deployment in the home environment and among friends. They cited the following associations: “benefit”, “joy”, “cognition of the interlocutor”, “interest”, “parents”, “respect”, “exchange of information”, etc.

Test results showed that in the first-place students have the value of the individual, then the value of the group and institution; and at the last – the value of dialogue. The data obtained as a result of testing indicate that 52.9% of students in the experimental group and 57.4% of students in the control group have an average level of cooperation: they are focused on expressing their personal position, the degree of involvement in the group's affairs depends on the situation, they are active in some public affairs, communication is selective. The remaining students are characterized by low motivation to participate in joint activities and public affairs of the institute. To correct and confirm the results for the selected indicators made it possible for such research methods as expert assessment and observation. Thus, a generalized analysis of students' answers showed that students mainly have medium and low levels of formation of a culture of behavior and appearance. Moreover, we have revealed that for most students, the way others behave and what they wear are of great importance.

The implementation of the dialogue approach and the definition of its pedagogical functions will create the prerequisite for the identification of problems and the development of meaning-forming activities. This approach contributes to the subjects of educational activity to engage in dialogue, and its concretization in pedagogical practice. It should be noted that the pedagogical functions of the dialogue are manifested in the process of development of meaning-forming activity when teachers are oriented toward solving problems associated with changes in the quality of co-organization of teachers and children as subjects of this activity. The pedagogical functions of the dialogue are aimed at creating and manifesting personal meanings of participants in joint activities. Dialogue in the educational process provides the relationship of sensory-emotional and reflective forms of existence of personal meanings and gradually develops a mutually complementary organization of joint activities of such disparate entities as a teacher and pupils.

In the context of the formation of a globalizing attitude and the creation of a single educational space, a conscious dialogic approach is required. Not realizing the need for dialogue is an obstacle in understanding the essence of the mechanism of “dialogical communication” as communication of equal entities and creating a condition for implementation. At the same time, the specifics of the educational process, which presupposes the initially set

functional inequality of its participants, means the illegitimacy and unproductiveness of the direct transfer of conceptual dialogue models from areas adjacent to pedagogy, which makes it particularly relevant to identify the pedagogical nature of the dialogue. However, to understand that there is a “dialogue” as a “special systemic whole” as a “special organization” in real pedagogical practice is possible only through “processes proceeding in this organization and, above all, functioning processes”, which determines not only the topic of the authors' article, but also the special development of this problem and its implementation in the logic of a system-activity approach.

## **Discussion**

We are convinced that in the implementation of dialogical interaction in the educational process and in organizing the socio-cultural development of students, an important role belongs to the teacher, who acts in equal communication not only as a professional, but also as a person. The success of the dialogue in the educational process largely depends on pedagogical skill, one of the main components of which is the appeal to the other, the desire and desire to enter into a trustful and open dialogue. The main result and purpose of the teacher is to develop the student's potential abilities. The unity of the processes of teaching and learning arises only when the purpose of the teaching is to develop the student's own potentials, the self-realization of his personality through the assimilation of social experience by him. Solving the problems of humanistic education, pedagogically effective is the influence that contributes to the development of the personality or prepares him.

Indeed, when an adult organizes and implements an educational impact on a child, he is based on his beliefs, in which his views on the world are concentrated, his attitude to this world and his understanding of how each person's behavior should actually be, including himself. Therefore, the real content of the educational impact is always the views, goals, relationships, behaviors that one person – the educator, parent, teacher – would like to make directly or indirectly the property of another. The teacher realizes his personal content with the help of certain means available to him – verbal and non-verbal.

Communicative skills that provide a solution to the problems of communication in the conditions of dialogical and monological speech of the teacher, form the basis of his professional speech culture. Among the communicative skills J. Röhner & A. Schütz [18] highlights the following:

- the ability to control their behavior – volitional qualities;
- the ability to observe, show flexibility – qualities of attention;
- social perception skills – “reading in the face”;
- the ability to understand, and not just see, i.e., adequately model the personality of the student, his mental state, etc. by external signs;
- the ability to “submit yourself” in communication with students; the ability to optimally structure your speech in a psychological sense, i.e., communication skills;
- the ability of verbal and non-verbal contact with students;
- gnostic skills – skills related to the awareness, systematization and transfer of information.



N. Samoilenko [19] along with communicative skills emphasizes the importance of communicative behavior of the teacher. In a broad sense, communicative behavior is understood as a set of rules and traditions of communication of a particular linguistic-cultural community. If we talk about the communicative behavior of the teacher, then this implies the organization of his speech and the corresponding speech behavior that affect the creation of an emotional and psychological atmosphere of communication between the teacher and students, on the nature of the relationship between them, on the style of their work.

For characterizing the communicative behavior of a teacher, such moments as the tone of speech, the justification of value judgments, the manner students are addressed, the manner they respond, the nature of facial expressions, gestures, and accompanying speech are significant. A great influence on the effectiveness of the teacher's professional activity is provided by the style of his dialogical communication. Some of the most productive are dialogue based on joint creative activity (projects, contests, holidays, etc.) and dialogue based on a friendly arrangement that precedes successful joint educational activities. Dialogue distance is also necessary, as it emphasizes the leading role of the teacher. As a limiter in this style, the differences between partners are: age, social status, etc. In the study Ö. Sakallı *et al.* [20] presented the following indicators of the dialogue style of the teacher:

- ability to orientate on the interlocutor;
- ability to build partnerships;
- willingness to listen carefully and adequately understand the interlocutor;
- emotional openness and sincerity in the expression of emotions and feelings;
- adequacy in presenting one's value position;
- taking into account individually-creative characteristics, cognitive and life experience of students, recognition of the individuality of each person;
- use of dialogue forms in the classroom;
- mastery of the culture of interrogation;
- maximum use of students' independence, their critical thinking and initiative;
- actualization of students' creative potential, their inclusion in the scientific dialectical search for truth;
- clarification of concepts and texts, the use of different languages of science;
- implementation of reflection and feedback;
- use of individual characteristics of temperament, intuition, improvisation;
- achieving results through discussion, integration of individual approaches.

In the teaching of humanitarian and general professional disciplines, dialogue plays a special, specific role: it acts as a catalyst for organizing an atmosphere of trust and openness, which is necessary for students to master universal human and socio-cultural values [21-24]. A skillfully organized dialogue contributes to the solution of various pedagogical problems: establishing mutual understanding between the subjects of the educational process, identifying various approaches to identifying and seeing the problems being discussed, creating a situation

free choice and expression of their position, timely adjustment of the process of socio-cultural development. Pedagogical dialogue as a way of interaction between the subjects of the educational process has a number of socio-cultural functions:

- compensatory (compensates by pedagogical means the lack of dialogue between various social groups);
- formative and corrective (establish and changes the system of personal views, the level of its thinking, motivational-value orientation);
- regulatory and activity (develops the ability to manage their emotions in order to maintain a constructive dialogue);
- information (expands cultural interests);
- integrative (joins forces to achieve goals in joint activities);
- appellative (attracts the attention of the object of dialogue and affects the interlocutor);
- emotive (provides a favorable emotional background through communication, a situation of success);
- creative (develops creative thinking).

The educational potential of the pedagogical dialogue increase when communication acts as a process of interaction between equal participants and is turned towards mutual enrichment and transformation. In other words, the relationship between the participants in the dialogue will be pedagogically fruitful if they are of a partnership nature, if there is moral equality and cooperation between the subjects of the dialogue [25-28]. We are sure that it is the respectful attitude of the participants in the pedagogical process to each other that leads to positive self-esteem, mutual trust and faith in one's abilities.

In the authors' work, pedagogical dialogue acts as one of the institutional resources to ensure the process of socio-cultural development of students. The provisions of the theory of resource management have found their application in the field of psychology, pedagogy and social work [29-32]. In practical psychology, the emphasis is on the ways and possibilities of updating the resources of the individual, the help of a psychologist or group in this process [33]. In pedagogical science, these provisions in teaching and upbringing have not yet been developed, although there is already a tendency to consider resources as means for solving a specific pedagogical problem, the educational situation [34; 35]. In social work, management of the use of public resources and the resources of an object (person, family, society) that find themselves in a difficult situation is studied.

Based on this idea, the pedagogical support of the process of socio-cultural development of freshmen can be considered as the management of the functioning and development of the system of resources (means) used to implement this process [36-38]. Huge educational potential also has various social institutions. They represent the very organized environment on which certain educational functions are assigned in relation to the younger generation. These include the student's family, cultural and everyday life institutions, educational institutions, clubs and interest groups, and the media. Each of them purposefully affects the individual [39]. Having examined

the process of socio-cultural development, we analyzed the impact area of the university environment on the student and came to the conclusion that the pedagogical dialogue of the subjects of the educational process (teacher – student, teacher – students, student – student) is one of the leading factors contributing to the creation of a positive emotional and psychological atmosphere of communication between the teacher and students, students among themselves. Pedagogical dialogue is defined as a partnership way of interaction between the subjects of the educational process, focused on the discussion style of discussing socio-cultural issues and their joint solution.

## Conclusions

In general, we can conclude that the culture of dialogue as a sociocultural component of the personality includes the following indicators:

- dialogue knowledge is the knowledge about the specifics, content, structure, forms, functions, styles and types of dialogue, about the rules of dialogue, about communication barriers, etc.;
- dialogical skills – the ability in emerging situations to establish, contact with different people, create situations of cooperation and dialogue, find conversation topics in various cases, choose adequate methods of interaction in business, emotional, pair, group or collective communication);
- value attitude to dialogue – attitude to dialogue partners as a goal, and not as a means of achieving their own well-being; interest in the process itself, dialogue, and not just its result;
- awareness of the importance and relevance of dialogue in all spheres of human life;

- openness to cooperation (active inclusion in joint activities; focus on the goal that collective work is dedicated to; the willingness to listen, understand and perceive different points of view, accept them tactfully and reasonably complement or disagree with them; focus on reaching mutually acceptable decisions;

- the desire in the general business not only to receive for oneself, but also to give as much as possible to others).

Pilot work has confirmed the success of the implemented complex of conditions of socio-cultural development of students:

1. Socio-pedagogical – compliance with the rules of dialogue and norms of behavior, the relationship of educational, cognitive and communicative activities, the unity of theory and practice, a differentiated approach to students, a teacher demonstrating a dialogue culture, a culture of behavior and a culture of appearance;
2. Personal-communicative – the formation of motivation to master the components of socio-cultural development, focus on creative self-realization in the dialogue, the desire for self-development in order to overcome the difficulties of dialogic communication;
3. Organizational-activity determination of the content of the dialogue, the use of various types of dialogical interaction, the establishment of subjective-subjective relations, control of the process of socio-cultural development.

## Acknowledgements

None.

## Conflict of Interest

None.

## References

- [1] Díez-Palomar J, Esther Chan MC, Clarke D, Padrós M. How does dialogical talk promote student learning during small group work? An exploratory study. *Learn Cult Soc Interact*. 2021;30(A):100540. DOI: [10.1016/j.lcsi.2021.100540](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2021.100540).
- [2] VandenBos GR. *American Psychological Association Dictionary of Psychology*. 2nd Edition. Washington: American Psychological Association.; 2015. DOI: [10.1037/14646-000](https://doi.org/10.1037/14646-000).
- [3] Jaspers K. *Writings on the university idea*. Basel: Schwabe Verlag; 2019. DOI: [10.24894/978-3-7965-3533-8](https://doi.org/10.24894/978-3-7965-3533-8).
- [4] Han J, Forbes H, Schaefer D. An exploration of how creativity, functionality, and aesthetics are related in design. *Res Eng Design*. 2021;32(3):289-307. DOI: [10.1007/s00163-021-00366-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00163-021-00366-9).
- [5] Yuan J. What is scientific culture? *Cult Sci*. 2022;5(3):124-7. DOI: [10.1177/20966083221118700](https://doi.org/10.1177/20966083221118700).
- [6] Seitkazy PB, Kalkeyeva KR, Aimagambetova RK, Kassymbekova NS, Askarovich TA, Jexembayeva GS. Civilizational and cultural approaches to the constructing of the education content in Kazakhstan. *Rev Eur Stud*. 2015;7(6):100-7. DOI: [10.5539/res.v7n6p100](https://doi.org/10.5539/res.v7n6p100).
- [7] Cui R, Teo P. Dialogic education for classroom teaching: A critical review. *Lang Educ*. 2021;35(3):187-203. DOI: [10.1080/09500782.2020.1837859](https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1837859).
- [8] Jackson GR. Using student development theory to inform intergroup dialogue research, theory, and practice. *J Divers High Educ*. 2022;15(2):194-206. DOI: [10.1037/dhe0000241](https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000241).
- [9] Elias A, Mansouri F. A systematic review of studies on interculturalism and intercultural dialogue. *J Intercult Stud*. 2020;41(4):490-523. DOI: [10.1080/07256868.2020.1782861](https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2020.1782861).
- [10] Kapferer J. Twilight of the enlightenment: The art fair, the culture industry, and the “creative class”. *Soc Anal*. 2010;54(2):9-27. DOI: [10.3167/sa.2010.540202](https://doi.org/10.3167/sa.2010.540202).
- [11] Zubarev AM. Bakhtin about “real world of life”: From sociology of the life-world to aesthetics of verbal creativity. *Ukr Soc J*. 2017;19(1-2):74-80. Available from: <https://periodicals.karazin.ua/usocjour/article/view/9552>.
- [12] Geurts B. Making sense of self talk. *Rev Phil Psychol*. 2018;9(2):271-85. DOI: [10.1007/s13164-017-0375-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13164-017-0375-y).
- [13] Vaschenko L. Educational dialogue as a method of formative assessment of school students’ learning outcomes. *Cont Profes Educ Theory Pract*. 2021;74(1):105-13. DOI: [10.28925/1609-8595.2023.1.9](https://doi.org/10.28925/1609-8595.2023.1.9).
- [14] Manca V. Life strategies. In *Infobiotics: Information in Biotic Systems*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer; 2013. P. 169-211. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-36223-1\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36223-1_4).

- [15] Vinella FL, Odo C, Lykourantzou I, Masthoff J. How personality and communication patterns affect online *ad-hoc* teams under pressure. *Front Artif Intell.* 2022;5:818491. DOI: [10.3389/frai.2022.818491](https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2022.818491).
- [16] Pickering MJ, Garrod S. Dialogue as a joint activity. In *Understanding Dialogue: Language Use and Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2021. P. 67-88. DOI: [10.1017/9781108610728.006](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108610728.006).
- [17] Grice P. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, J.L. Morgan. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 3*. New York: Academic Press; 1975. P. 41-58. Available from: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ls/study/packs/Grice-Logic.pdf>.
- [18] Röhner J, Schütz A. *Psychology of communication*. Cham: Springer; 2023. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-030-60170-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60170-6).
- [19] Samoilenko N. Axiological approach to the formation of speech culture of primary education students. *Int Sci J Educ Ling.* 2022;1(5):7-20. DOI: [10.46299/j.isjel.20220105.02](https://doi.org/10.46299/j.isjel.20220105.02).
- [20] Sakallı Ö, Tlili A, Altunay F, et al. The role of tolerance education in diversity management: A cultural historical activity theory perspective. *Sage Open.* 2021;11(4). DOI: [10.1177/21582440211060831](https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211060831).
- [21] Kieliszek Z, Gocłowska E. The Fate and Character of Creon from Sophocles' "Theban Trilogy" in the Context of Aristotle's Determinants of Tragedy. *Studia Warmin.* 2021;58:61-85. DOI: [10.31648/sw.6383](https://doi.org/10.31648/sw.6383).
- [22] Kieliszek Z. Assessment of the Rationality of Gender Studies from the Perspective of Bocheński's Concept of Philosophical Superstition. *Philos.* 2022;50(2):581-94. DOI: [10.1007/s11406-021-00406-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11406-021-00406-7).
- [23] Gahramanova S. Prospects of development of the strategic policy of corporate social responsibility and sustainable business in Azerbaijan. *Bus Strat Develop.* 2023;6(4):795-804. DOI: [10.1002/bsd2.278](https://doi.org/10.1002/bsd2.278).
- [24] Madiyarova, D., Sembieva, L., Nurumov, A. Financial aspects of healthcare reform in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Act Probl Econ.* 2013;139(1):407-18.
- [25] Anarbayev Y, Pentayev T, Molzhigitova D, Omarbekova A, Omarova S. Analysis of key swot-characteristics of agri-business, management and land use in Kazakhstan: The case of Turkestan region. *Acad Entrepren J.* 2021;27(5):1-9.
- [26] Sharyi V, Supriah O, Kalinichenko B. Resolution of investment conflicts between the state and foreign companies in the context of crisis prevention. *Soc Leg Stud.* 2023;6(4):200-07. DOI: [10.32518/sals4.2023.200](https://doi.org/10.32518/sals4.2023.200).
- [27] Mugauina R, Madiyarova D, Shishmanov K. Using the supply-chain management for developing oil industries in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Int J Supp Chain Manag.* 2020;9(2):1086-94.
- [28] Sandra L, Aritonang S. Lockdown Countdown: Lockdown Sentiment Analysis on Twitter Using Artificial Neural Network. In: *2021 International Conference on Data Science and Its Applications, ICoDSA 2021* (pp. 198–202). Bandung: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers; 2021. DOI: [10.1109/ICoDSA53588.2021.9617212](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICoDSA53588.2021.9617212).
- [29] Sandra L, Lumbangaol F. When Homecoming is not Coming: 2021 Homecoming Ban Sentiment Analysis on Twitter Data Using Support Vector Machine Algorithm. In: *8th International Conference on ICT for Smart Society: Digital Twin for Smart Society, ICISS 2021 - Proceeding*. Virtual, Bandung: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers; 2021. DOI: [10.1109/ICISS53185.2021.9533255](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICISS53185.2021.9533255).
- [30] Samoilenko Y, Britchenko I, Levchenko I, Lošonczy P, Bilichenko O, Bodnar O. Economic Security of the Enterprise Within the Conditions of Digital Transformation. *Econ Affairs.* 2022;67(4):619-29. DOI: [10.46852/0424-2513.4.2022.28](https://doi.org/10.46852/0424-2513.4.2022.28).
- [31] Sharyi VI, Samoilenko LY, Ovcharenko AO. Strategic priorities of states in the black sea region. *J Adv Res Law Econ.* 2019;10(6):1786-93. DOI: [10.14505/jarle.v10.6\(44\).20](https://doi.org/10.14505/jarle.v10.6(44).20).
- [32] Dunayev I, Kuchma M, Byelova L, Jatkiewicz P, Bilichenko O, Poberezhets H. Wartime destruction: regional assessment of damage to Ukraine's infrastructure. *Int J Environ Stud.* 2024. DOI: [10.1080/00207233.2024.2314862](https://doi.org/10.1080/00207233.2024.2314862).
- [33] Sharyi VI. The Arctic: The struggle for resources and influence in the region. *Compar Strat.* 2023;42(6):776-88. DOI: [10.1080/01495933.2023.2263336](https://doi.org/10.1080/01495933.2023.2263336).
- [34] Mysak Y, Galyanchuk I, Kuznetsova M. Development of mathematical models and the calculations of elements of convective heat transfer systems. *East-Eur J Enterp Technol.* 2016;4(8-82):33-41. DOI: [10.15587/1729-4061.2016.74826](https://doi.org/10.15587/1729-4061.2016.74826).
- [35] Madiyarova DM, Argyngazinov AA. Export potential of small and medium enterprises of kazakhstan: analysis of regional opportunities. *Res Econ Anthropol.* 2022;42:207-17. DOI: [10.1108/S0190-128120220000042020](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0190-128120220000042020).
- [36] Sutbayeva R, Beisengaliyev B, Madiyarova D, Turekulova A, Kapenova A. Impact of social economy on the environmental protection. *J Environ Manag Tour.* 2021;12(3):690-702. DOI: [10.14505/jemt.v12.3\(51\).09](https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v12.3(51).09).
- [37] Kieliszek Z. Potential of Immanuel Kant's Philosophy in the Context of The Encyclical *Amoris laetitia* of Pope Francis. *Logos.* 2023;117:36-45. DOI: [10.24101/logos.2023.69](https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2023.69).
- [38] Ziberi BF, Rexha D, Ibraimi X, Avdiaj B. Empirical Analysis of the Impact of Education on Economic Growth. *Econ.* 2022;10(4):89. DOI: [10.3390/economies10040089](https://doi.org/10.3390/economies10040089).
- [39] Sandra L, Marcel Gunarso G, Fredicia, Riruma OW. Are University Students Independent: Twitter Sentiment Analysis of Independent Learning in Independent Campus Using RoBERTa Base IndoLEM Sentiment Classifier Model. In: *2021 International Seminar on Machine Learning, Optimization, and Data Science, ISMODE 2021* (pp. 249–253). Jakarta: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers; 2022. DOI: [10.1109/ISMODE53584.2022.9743110](https://doi.org/10.1109/ISMODE53584.2022.9743110).

## **Педагогічний діалог як функція соціокультурного розвитку: Досвід Казахстану**

### **Жулдиз Алібаєва**

Кандидат педагогічних наук, викладач-дослідник  
Павлодарський педагогічний університет імені А. Маргулана  
140000, вул. Миру, 60, м. Павлодар, Республіка Казахстан

### **Жулдиз Абішева**

Старший викладач  
Семейський університет імені Шакаріма  
070000, вул. Глінки, 20А, м. Семей, Республіка Казахстан

### **Салтанат Ахтанова**

Кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент  
Євразійський національний університет імені Л.Н. Гумільова  
010008, вул. Сатпаєва, 2, м. Астана, Республіка Казахстан

### **Карлигаш Койшибаєва**

Аспірант  
Кизилординський університет імені Коркіта Ата  
120000, вул. Айтеке Бі, 29А, м. Кизилорда, Республіка Казахстан

### **Мухтар Бектурганов**

Начальник кафедри  
Національний університет оборони Республіки Казахстан  
020000, просп. Турана, 72, м. Астана, Республіка Казахстан

## **Анотація**

**Актуальність.** Організація діалогової взаємодії є актуальною на початковому етапі навчання у вищому навчальному закладі, оскільки діалог створює основу для поважних і доброзичливих відносин між студентами, сприяє плідній співпраці всіх суб'єктів освітнього процесу.

**Мета.** Мета статті – дослідити значення діалогу в соціокультурному розвитку особистості.

**Методологія.** Методологічну основу для вирішення цієї наукової проблеми становлять теоретичні засади системно-діяльнісного підходу. Фундаментальним моментом дослідження є методологічна основа дослідницької пропозиції - вивчення функцій діалогу.

**Результати.** В результаті проведеного дослідження було виявлено, що для ефективної співпраці з іншими людьми в різних видах діяльності, успішного засвоєння загальнолюдських цінностей і норм поведінки студент повинен володіти культурою діалогу. Формування культури діалогу є одним із напрямів реалізації завдань соціокультурного розвитку.

**Висновки.** Культура діалогу передбачає прийняття себе та іншого з позицій моральних і гуманістичних цінностей, сприяє розвитку особистості та суспільства в цілому.

**Ключові слова:** студенти; норми поведінки; моральні цінності; розвиток; освіта