

**DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v8i3.2157**

**Citation:** Zagorodnova, V., Panova, N., Nischeta, V., & Hreb, M. (2019). Intercultural Dialogue as Rhetorical Means of Forming of Multilingual Personality. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 8(3), 209-219. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v8i3.2157>

### **Intercultural Dialogue as Rhetorical Means of Forming of Multilingual Personality**

**Viktoria Zagorodnova<sup>1</sup>, Natalia Panova<sup>2</sup>,**

**Volodymyr Nischeta<sup>3</sup>, Mariia Hreb<sup>4</sup>**

#### **Abstract**

The state and conditions of functioning of the Ukrainian language and languages of national minorities in Ukraine have led us to think about finding ways to balance the complex sociolinguistic situation in the country. In this regard, it is no coincidence the direction of modern linguadidactics on communicative and functional learning of designated languages in establishments of secondary education with multiethnic contingent of students. The social role of dialogue, connected with change of socio-cultural connections and cultural codes is becoming more and more important. The forming of global human civilization, numerous transnational and interregional conflicts, need for mutual understanding, cooperation and partnership have determined the relevance of the dialogical form of communication, which has led to a deepening of dialogue not only human thinking but also its civilized existence. The dialogical thinking is necessary for overcoming ideological stereotypes, the monopoly of thought and one-sidedness of globalism, for the forming of a person who would be able to build his relationship on the basis of humanization, finding a reasonable compromise, mutual respect, and tolerance. In the context of conceptual positions of modern rhetoric, the phenomenon of rhetorical dialogue as a unit of rhetorical communication is singled out. It is worth considering the rhetorical dialogue in the prospection of a relativistic aspect of modern rhetoric, taking into account the pragmatic sense of the influence of communicators on each other in the process of harmonizing dialogue, effective and optimal communication. That's why the intercultural dialogue in the process of forming of multilingual personality is defined as rhetorical. In the giving article, the subject of the discussion is highlighting the relevance of the intercultural dialogue as rhetorical on language lessons at schools with polyethnic contingent of pupils, clarification of the main aspects of dialogic interaction of contacting cultures, analysis of groups of national and specific vocabulary for learning by pupils-polylinguals.

**Keywords:** Intercultural dialogue, Rhetorical dialogue, Multilingual personality, Intercultural communication, Cultural identification, Cultural adaptation, Tolerance, Multilingual education.

---

<sup>1</sup> Berdyansk State Pedagogical University, the Faculty of Philology and Social Communications, Shmidta St., 4, Berdyansk town, Zaporozhye region, Ukraine, 71112.

<sup>2</sup> Berdyansk State Pedagogical University, the Faculty of Philology and Social Communications, Shmidta St., 4, Berdyansk town, Zaporozhye region, Ukraine, 71112.

<sup>3</sup> Berdyansk State Pedagogical University, the Faculty of Philology and Social Communications, Shmidta St., 4, Berdyansk town, Zaporozhye region, Ukraine, 71112.

<sup>4</sup> Berdyansk State Pedagogical University, the Faculty of Philology and Social Communications, Shmidta St., 4, Berdyansk town, Zaporozhye region, Ukraine, 71112.

## Introduction

Over the last decade in the light of the processes of globalization in the informational society among a great number of various culturological paradigms, a great attention is paid to the dialogical approach (paradigm of the dialogue of cultures), a leading principle of which is the emphasis of constructive role of external impulses in formation and development of national spirituality that is embodied in ideas of culture as forms of simultaneous existence and communication of people of different – past, present and future – cultures, form of dialogue and intergeneration of these cultures (Bibler, 1989).

This idea has gone through a long evolution from artistic and philosophical reflections of the 19-20th centuries (I. Ghete, A. Lamartin, L. Feuerbach, V. Dilthey, E. Husserl, K. Jaspers, M. Haydeger, J. Sartre, M. Bummer, G. Marsel, E. Fromm, M. Danilevsky, J. Derrida) – through the theoretical developments of ideologists (N. Bakhtin, Yu. Lotman, V. Bibler), from the middle of the 20th century – to their wide using in modern humanities (V. Gorsky, D. Likhachov, P. Tolochko, A. Volynets, G. Ball, S. Kopylov, I. Zyaziun). The meaningful aspect of this evolution is: at first, in the bosom of worldview knowledge appeared the idea about interpersonal, subject-subjective communication as a basis of human existence in the culture (“tuizm” by L. Feuerbach, “communication” by K. Jaspers, “being for another” by J. Sartre, “sphere between” by M. Buber, “love” by E. Fromm); later on the giving thought from interpretation of the culture as an anthropological phenomenon was transferred to sociocultural subject (P. Gurevich, V. Machlin, O. Makhov, L. Novikova, I. Peshkov, E. Tselma) to attempt to distinguish stages and principles of the dialogue of cultures in works of Yu. Lotman and D. Likhachov. Then the problem of the dialogue of cultures was solved through the postmodern awareness of the concept of text as a main carrier of cultural traditions – revealed mainly through the problem of interaction of texts (“text in text” at Yu. Lotman and text in the cultural context at J. Derrida), that lead out the paradigm on the level of correspondence with methodological principles of historicism, phenomenology, hermeneutics, deconstructivism (Zagorodnova, 2008). In the real research field, all defined stages and trends didn't exist in their pure form, they intertwined in space and time, creating favorable conditions for creative using of dialogical approach in different fields.

Over time scientists began to consider dialogism as a philosophical direction and way of thinking. From the point of view of philosophy, the dialogue is a specific way of awareness of the world, thinking, development and realization of the man's essence. The problem of dialogicity is closely connected with the history of human consciousness, development of thinking, problems forming of a creative mind and creative personality. In the modern world, it is not limited to only ontological characteristics and functions, concentrated on individual personality (Zagorodnova, 2008).

So, the forming of dialogical thinking is a requirement of time. One of the means of forming such thinking is study and thinking of humanitarian subjects at schools with polyethnic contingent of pupils, in particular, the teaching of state and foreign languages.

As for learning language at school, then in this case the paradigm of the dialog of culture is defined through the “cross-cultural dialogue”, which promotes the reorientation of the pedagogical

process from mechanical transfer of uniform knowledge to creative interaction on the basis of complex interdisciplinary knowledge (from native, Ukrainian and foreign languages; native, Ukrainian and foreign literatures, history, etc.) in the context of humanization and humanitarianization of educational systems.

The cross-cultural dialogue in the education and related with it school of the dialogue of cultures and culturologically oriented teaching as linguadidactic manifestations of postmodern tradition of the dialogue and directions of humanization of education envisage creation and realization of new, democratized pedagogical system (Zagrodnova, 2008).

Working out the cross-cultural approach to teaching language in the context of the culture, we oriented on activity and communication (man of culture), forming of which should take place, according to G. Ball, "... the purposeful inclusion of participants of the educational process into "great dialogues" which unfold in human culture, because they are leading mechanisms for its development" (Ball, 1997). In the process of teaching, it is necessary to create a situation of pedagogical interaction, during which takes place creative, critical and dialogical rethinking by pupils the original texts of culture. As it is emphasized "... methodology of school of dialogue of cultures is directed as against the dogmatic authoritarian pedagogy, which is a decisive feature of totalitarianism and against its opposition – ideological chaos and elective mixture of value orientations" (Lutay, 1996).

Language teaching, both in theoretical and applied aspects, should envisage not only a linguistic specific of the national language but also culturological aspects of the worldview of native speakers of this language. We can say that current trend in study of the language and culture of the certain nation – from confrontation and comparison of languages and cultures to dialogue; only under condition of mastering the holistic system of ideas about national customs, traditions, country realities, the language of which is studied, the full communication is possible, and mastering the certain language is impossible without ethno-sociocultural knowledge of the nation. The new tasks of teaching any language in the context of the dialogue of cultures point at the necessity of studying the extralinguistic parameters of communication and language environment where the specific language functions. Directly in the educational process, working with pupils who speak another language, have different worldview, sometimes have different faith, national culture, we can not ignore the national model of worldview which has already developed at pupils, we can not take into account certain historical, ethnological, sociological and psycholinguistic features of them as representatives of another language and cultural community (Zagrodnova, 2009).

Education of the language personality should be directed to language signs of the people's culture, language etiquette, and values. For a long time, narrowly pragmatic, utilitarian approach to language as a mean of communication obstructed all other functions of the language. In the process of language learning, there was no understanding between native speakers of different languages and cultures. Language-teachers did not have the necessary knowledge (Hreb, 2016). Such training courses as "Linguaculturology", "Basics of intercultural communication" and "Basics of comparative language study" didn't use by future teachers for learning language and literature. It was a great drawback in

the training of future specialists. The well-known German scientist Wilhelm von Humboldt argued that different languages are not different denotations of the same thing, but its different vision. Word is the imprint, not the subject, but its sensuous image, created by it in our soul in the process of language creation. Language becomes the intermediary between the world of subjects which man knows and the individual who seeks to know it (Humboldt, 2000).

The contact between peoples with different experience is done through the contact of languages, therefore on the border of the collision of languages more bright is expressed the collision of ways of life, material and spiritual cultures – collision at the level of subconscious, therefore bilingualism is a dialogue of worldviews, systems of the world. It is clear that speaking different languages people can see the world differently, through the prism of their languages (Zagorodnova, 2009). Since the national composition of thinking is materially fixed verbally, one can take into account the understanding of the language picture of the world as “... fixed in the language and specific for a certain language group the scheme of reality’s perception” (Yakovleva, 1996). So, the language picture of the world is a kind of worldview through the language prism. Intuitively we compare national pictures of the world, highlighting similar and different, that is necessary for feedback and self-correction. In the situation of clash of cultures, participants of the communicative act through non-identification of conceptual pictures of the world constantly fix not only components which are coincided but those which distinguish languages because of cultures’ interference – wider interference of the national worldview.

## **Results and Discussions**

### ***Teaching in the context of dialogue***

In the process of non-native language studying, the teacher and pupil inevitably forced to compare non-native realities of life and culture with a native through the search of different and similar to the moment of collision. The background knowledge helps to take into account the common, national and specific features during the language teaching.

The term background knowledge is defined in linguistics as “mutual understanding by communicants the content of language signs” (Akhmanova, 1966). Accumulating in human consciousness throughout the whole life, background knowledge forms the semantic level of communication. As Yu. Chatnyak notes, “... the important feature, common to most cases of language using is application in the text the statement of pre-accumulated knowledge for making conclusions” (Charnyak, 1983). Hence, the absence of background knowledge leads to a total or partial misunderstanding of the interlocutor.

At the modern stage of the development of linguadidactics, the most promising approach is the process of teaching non-native language from the position of the dialogue of cultures. By implementing a comparative approach, the phenomena of language and culture are dealt with the native language and culture of the pupil. In this way, the influence of social, psychological, religious, educational and other factors of forming both individual personality and nationality in general are taken into consideration (Zagorodnova, 2013).

This approach is relatively new in language teaching. Hence, the method of conducting such an approach is not perfect; it requires a fundamental rethinking of linguaculturological, monological approaches and concepts, the development of dialogical linguistics. It is necessary to work out the teaching and methodological support of this important aspect of language teaching at schools with polyethnic contingent of pupils.

For school language education is relevant the description of cultures of national communities in the comparison with Ukrainian or foreign culture and language; ascertaining of native speakers' background knowledge which are subject for comparison; complex of language units with national and cultural semantics in the general array of comparable languages; linguistic country study dictionaries, especially of comparable character (Panova, 2007).

But today it is important not only comparative analysis of vital values but also language means and country-specific information in different national cultures. In the process of communication all these elements at all levels (verbal, non-verbal) are intertwined (Manakin, 1994). One of the tasks of modern methods of language teaching as the second one is to put pupils in situations as close to reality as possible in which they can establish language and non-language means of achieving a certain communicative purpose. The teacher's practice includes linguaculturology which gives the system description of language and cultural facts in their interaction and interconnection, studies the language picture of the world (Panova, 2009).

The communicative linguistics analyzes language units in specific communicative situations that make it possible to show the difference of their functioning in different communicative conditions. Such interest is due to the fact that a communicative approach to word allows revealing the most significant features of its semantics, which play an important role in the implementation of a communicative function. For effective preparation of lesson-dialogue a teacher should pay attention to the main aspects of dialogical interaction of contacting cultures (Zagrodnova, 2008):

- *bilingual aspect*, which includes the problems of interfection (linguistic and sociocultural), code switching, language deficit, convergence (identical, but independent from each other phenomena, arising in the culture of different peoples) and divergence (opposite convergence) of cultures;
- *pragmatic aspect*, offers linguistics pragmatic in the study of intercultural communication (specific of interaction of multinational communicants, peculiarities of implementation of intentions of participants in the dialogue of cultures);
- *cognitive aspect* includes the study of cognitive features, ways of perception and understanding of languages, cultures, which are studied by different national contingent of pupils;
- *axiological aspect*, directed on revealing of characteristics which relate to phenomena of language and culture, which are studied by representatives of different national cultures;
- *aesthetic aspect* opens ways of aesthetic perception of language and culture.

From the methodological point of view, both for a teacher and pupil, the most significant is

denotative, connotative, functional and stylistic macrocomponents, which are in the structure of most words. The denotative macrocomponent is an object and conceptual or simply conceptual information connected with reflection of extra-language reality. The connotative macrocomponent expresses the attitude of a person who speaks to the subject of nomination in the form of emotion or denotat's evaluation. The functional and stylistic macrocomponent characterizes the affiliation of the word to a certain national style. These components give a complete idea not only about the meaning of the word, but also about the possibilities of using in certain situations of communication.

In the process of learning language it is important to understand the background characteristics of the word. Hence, linguists understand that "...content of the verbal sign in which the culture's knowledge or scientific knowledge is reflected" (Sternin, 2000). Words that have background need special comments contained in lexicographic sources, for example, in linguistic country study dictionaries, encyclopedias, or the comment of "background" should offer the teacher in the process of the work with semantic of lexical unit. For teaching the language of pupils of national communities, it is necessary to take into account such groups of national and specific vocabulary (Zagorodnova, 2008):

*1. The first group of national and specific vocabulary – names of real objects of the outside world:*

- names which denote single-order concepts for different languages, distinctive in degree of detailing and meaningful content of meanings;
- names which denote specific, unique for certain language range of the concept (without equivalent vocabulary);
- names which denote close concepts of different prototype assignments (word equivalents with different lexical backgrounds);

*2. The second group of national and specific vocabulary – names of concepts of collective ethnic consciousness:*

- cultural and predetermined word-concepts, designation of abstract specific concepts;
- names which contain estimated-value connotative component;
- words which belong to the sphere of mythical categories, generated by collective consciousness of the ethnic group.

For school education it is important to analyze the above-mentioned groups of national and specific vocabulary, since one of the main requirements for organization of linguaculturological work is vocabulary with national and cultural component.

We have considered the pedagogical foundations of intercultural teaching of bilingual pupils, pupils-polylinguals of native, state and foreign languages in establishments of secondary education with polyethnic contingent of pupils. There have been defined that problem of study of related and unrelated languages is relevant today and it is based on the research of language contacts and

connections which have in linguistics long and strong traditions, it is based on fundamental as for setting of the problem and attracting of rich factual material works. We have studied the purpose, tasks, main methods and techniques of language teaching and also forms of educational and research activity of bilingual pupils and polylinguals in conditions of intercultural language teaching.

The result of such teaching with above-mentioned conceptual bases should be formation of cross-cultural communicative competence of the specified category of pupils, it is an important condition for successful integration into polyethnic society, and allows them to take part effectively in the process of interethnic communication and to prevent the negative effects of the process of globalization.

The cross-cultural communicative competence is a structural phenomenon which includes such components: orientation in various situations of interethnic cultural communication, which is based on linguaculturological and intercultural knowledge and life experience of bilingual (polylingual); ability to interact effectively with others through the understanding of oneself and others with constant change of mental states, interpersonal relationship and conditions of social multiethnic environment; adequate orientation of bilingual (polylingual) in itself, own psychological potential, partner's potential, in situation; ability to build intercultural dialogue with another nationality; internal means of regulation of communicative actions; cross-cultural knowledge, abilities and skills of harmonious communication; internal resources, necessary for creating of effective and optimal communicative action in certain range of situations of interpersonal interaction (Zagrodnova, 2008).

#### ***Dialogue as a rhetorical tool of formation of multilingual personality***

The modern rhetoric developed by H. Perelman and germinated on the basis of relativistic essence of neopositivist and postpositivist tendencies of the philosophy of the 20th century establishes the norm of rhetorical communication (the term introduced by B. Franz-Berenger), which propagates the a priori thesis: the ability to build reasoning arises as ability to persuade another, to transfer another their confidence and faith, connected with a certain system of values and scale of reality's comprehension (Gritsanov, 2001). This statement is fully corresponded with the theory and practice of intercultural dialogue, after all, deliberate reasoning of every communicator in the process of dialogical interaction appears as an expression of the subject's culture and therefore the phenomenon of culture. It's quite natural that rhetorical communication in intercultural dialogue predicts a change of world models in the minds of communicants.

One of the postulates of modern rhetoric, which studies and describes the ways of speech influence on the model of human world, is isolation of the rhetorical dialogue's phenomenon – an element of rhetorical communication. The rhetorical dialogue is a dialogue, which is built as interaction of equal subjects, which discuss one topic by generally accepted ways, agreeing the meaning in accordance with general rules; it is special communicative activity (communication) as for creating and realization of rhetorical texts, directed to other subjects (Nischeta, 2017). In the context of intercultural communication we define: rhetorical dialogue is an intercultural communication of subjects as an exchange of rhetorical texts which represent subjective, address, reflexive completed statements,

created with pragmatic instruction to reach the addressee.

In this context the essential peculiarity of intercultural dialogue as a rhetorical is the fact that in the process of its realization it is not only exchange of rhetorical texts as products of human activity but the exchange of personalized meanings – the dialogue of local cultures as dialogue meanings. Thus, modern rhetoric dictates the necessity of establishing the norm of optimal communication, in contrast to norm of optimal communication propagated by classical rhetoric. The optimal communication is a communication where the achievement of the goal by speaker is combined with favorable for listener effects, it is a mutually effective communication. A harmonious dialogue, which is able to establish the harmony in relations of participants of intercultural communication, is possible only under the condition of orientation of communicants on the optimal communication.

Described above the new tasks of school language education in the context of the dialogue of cultures should be considered through the prism of modern rhetoric's conceptions. Unlike classical philosophy, the relativistic philosophical thought doesn't emphasize attention on the problem of finding the truth, true knowledge (episteme). Similarly, the modern rhetoric as opposed to classical focuses attention on the study of the human dimension, changeable human thought, plausible, personality knowledge – doxa. It is precisely the doxa of a particular native speaker (worldview, faith, ethnically and socially predetermined ideological positions, values as phenomena of personality's culture and reflection of ethnic culture) is a sense of influences and mutual influence of communicants in the process of intercultural dialogue as rhetorical. Based on positions of subjective and evaluative paradigm of modern rhetoric, in school language education of bilingual pupils it is necessary to pay attention to forming at pupils the realization that optimal (harmonizing) dialogical interaction is possible if its subjects (1) recognize each other equal partners; (2) discuss the same topic, broadcasting solidarity meanings; (3) use mutually accepted means and act according to culturally agreed rules; (4) freely and reasonably exchange evaluative judgments, formed on the basis of sociocultural experience of sensory perception and experience of life activity and life realization.

The intercultural learning of bilingual pupils can be based on rhetorical dialogue of the subjects of educational process who can free orientate in the role positions of the dialogue, they will be able to: 1) to organize different types of dialogues (dialogue-unison with the aim to give information, confirmation of information which determines cultural norms; dialogue-theater with the aim to broadcast the new knowledge, to form intentions, to make decisions, to exercise external actions and actions in internal state of man; dialogue-teaching with the aim to bring pupils to norms of knowledge; dialogue-education with the aim to stimulate pupils to estimate their spiritual state and behavior; dialogue-propaganda with the aim to change pupils' behavior in the process of giving them the new information); 2) to implement different rhetorical pathos (pathos of efficiency – ability to keep friendly relations in combination with insight as ability to ask questions and communicability as an ability to enter into a dialogue; pathos of determination – ability to deny, to assert, to make decision; pathos education – teaching skills and life skills, orientation in life as a cultural space) (Nischeta, 2014).

Considering the intercultural dialogue as rhetorical in the process of study of bilingual pupils it



is necessary to create educational process on the basis of realization the value-variation model of the educational choice, which according to A. Kondakov implies: 1) Personality orientation of education; 2) Value orientation of education (values harmonize on the basis of the principle of additionality in such way, that dominant value surely supported by the opposite of it – if at school the innovational approach is dominated, then special efforts should be directed to maintaining stability; if the basis of activity is pedagogy of cooperation, then authoritarian technologies will ensure the stability of the process); 3) Principled opportunity of modeling educational programs with any specific number of variants with the purpose of satisfaction of various educational needs (Kondakov, 2004). We consider the proposed conception as innovative and complement it principled position: values and value orientations of native speaker we consider as sociocultural characteristics of personality, which appearing in speech, are the pragmatic basis of rhetorical texts of communicants and organizational basis of speech influence in the process of intercultural dialogue as rhetorical.

### **Conclusion**

The experience of work at schools with polyethnic contingent of pupils indicates that effectiveness of language learning in conditions of the dialogue of culture depends on the consideration of interdependent linguaculturological and methodological issues. The linguistic aspect of the problem involves:

- research of communicatively meaningful lexical layers for pupils of national communities;
- description of semantics of every word through the notion “component of meaning”;
- analysis of peripheral semes;
- analysis of semantic process which takes place in lexical meanings of words in the process of functioning them in different situations of communication;
- creation of lexicographical dictionaries which would contain as much as possible information about the semantic structure of words which are included in them.

The methodological support of the educational process in forming of lexical competence of bilingual pupils includes:

- creation of educational literature with scientifically determined types of tasks and exercises, aimed at forming at pupils skills of correct selection and appropriate using of lexical units in different communicative acts;
- preparation of educational dictionaries which would demonstrate peculiarities of semes’ actualization depending on the communicative task.

The modern rhetoric is directly connected with the search of true knowledge for a man, with a cognition of facts and phenomena of displayed reality, solves problems of speech interaction and mutual understanding, therefore the rhetorical aspect is regarded as ontological immanent feature of language education. And since culture is a dialogue of local cultures, and acts of culture are always configured to interaction with creative acts, the intercultural dialogue in the process of learning

language by bilingual pupils is considered as rhetorical.

The introduction of dialogical interaction of contacting cultures at Ukrainian language lessons at schools with polyethnic contingent of pupils is socially necessary. In school language learning, it is important to take into account contacts of languages and cultures that are the life reality in polyethnic regions of Ukraine. The necessary condition of dialogue of cultures at the lesson is a comparative analysis of ethnocultural lexics of languages which learn pupils, that provides description of main lexical, background and symbolic meanings of the word; forming of register of ethnocultural lexical units in multilingual comparison. The enrichment of pupils' speech with ethnocultural lexical units is successfully realized on condition of using methods and techniques which provide realization of in-depth analysis of meaning of foreign word in comparison with native, complex application of different kind of speech activity on the basis of ethnoculturological text, regular inclusion of pupils in pair and group kind of activity, regular appeal to the pupils' life experience.

The dialogue of cultures at the language lesson should be made in such a way that not only actively enrich the pupils' vocabulary but form a tolerant and interested attitude towards other languages and cultures, to improve communicative culture in multilingual society.

## References

- Akhmanova, O. S. (1966). Dictionary of linguistic terms. Moscow.
- Andreychina, K. (1977). The issue of national culture accounting of pupils during compiling a linguistic country study dictionary. Moscow.
- Ball, G. (1997). On the verge of culture's logic. Moscow.
- Bibler, V. S. (1989). Culture. Dialogue of cultures (Experience of defining). Issues of philosophy, 6, 38.
- Charnyak Yu. (1983). New in foreign linguistics. Conclusion and knowledge. Moscow.
- Gritsanov, A. A. (2001). World encyclopedia: philosophy. Minsk.
- Hreb, M. N. (2016). Nutzung des didaktischen Potenzials traditioneller und computerorientierter Unterrichts methoden in Lexik und Phraseologie an der pädagogischen Hochschule. Dialog der Sprachen - Dialog der Kulturen. Die Ukraine aus globaler Sicht (international internet conference).
- Hreb, M. N. (2016). The methodical aspect of work under the enlargement of students' vocabulary in pedagogical higher educational establishments. Education and society. International collection of scientific works of the Berdyansk state pedagogical university. (internet edition). 137-143.
- Humboldt, V. (2000). Selected works in linguistics. Moscow.
- Kochergan, M. P. (1999). General linguistics. Kyiv.
- Kondakov, A. M. (2004). Models of educational choice and main competences as educational resources for the development of personality, society and state. World of psychology, 2, 230-235.
- Lutay, V. S. (1996). Philosophy of modern education. Kyiv.
- Manakin, V. N. (1994). Basics of contrastive lexicology: closely related and related languages.

Kirovograd.

Nikolaeva, S. Yu. (2003). General European recommendations in language education: study, teaching, evaluation. Kyiv.

Nischeta, V. (2014). Methods of rhetoric teaching at school. Kyiv.

Nischeta, V. (2017). Methods of forming of rhetorical competence of general school pupils. Kyiv: Monograph.

Panova, N. (2007). The role of language and speech in normative and non-normative communication. Collection of scientific works of the Institute of psychology named after G. Kostiuk of APS of Ukraine, 7(10), 289-297.

Panova, N. (2008). The psychological functions of non-normative speech constructs in communicative behavior of students youth. Donetsk: Monograph.

Panova, N. (2009). The reflection as a mechanism of forming of critical thinking (theoretical aspect). Collection of scientific works of Berdyansk state pedagogical university (pedagogical sciences), 2, 94-205.

Sternin, I. A. (2000). Models of the description of communicative behavior. Voronezh.

Yakovleva E. S. (1996). To the description of Russian linguistic picture of the world. Russian language abroad, 1-3, 47-49.

Zagorodnova, V. F. (2006). Learning of lexicology in conditions of dialogue of cultures. Nizhin.

Zagorodnova, V. F. (2008). Crosscultural study of lexics by bilingual pupils in conditions of intercultural communication. Actual problems of culturology and pedagogy (international conference) (pp. 205-210). Saint Petersburg.

Zagorodnova, V. F. (2008). Forming of critical thinking of bilingual pupils in the process of cross-cultural teaching of the Ukrainian language. Collection of scientific works of Berdyansk state pedagogical university (pedagogical sciences), 4, 71-81.

Zagorodnova, V. F. (2009). The principle of cross-cultural dialogism as one of the basis of humanization of the language educational content. Collection of scientific works of National M. Dragomanov pedagogical university (philological sciences), 8, 242-248.

Zagorodnova, V. F. (2010). Ukrainian language in the dialogue of cultures. Kyiv.

Zagorodnova, V. F. (2013). Ukrainian language teaching in the context of the cultures' dialogue. Collection of scientific works of Berdyansk state pedagogical university (pedagogical sciences), 1, 115-124.