

ОСВІТА У ФІЛОСОФСЬКО-АНТРОПОЛОГІЧНИХ РЕФЛЕКСІЯХ

doi: 10.33842/22195203-2026-36-137-9-17

UDC 372.881

**DIALOGICAL STRATEGIES IN THE CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL SPACE:
METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS AND INTERCULTURAL UNDERSTANDING**

Iryna Barantsova

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8660-8089>*Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University*

The article examines the methodological foundations and essential characteristics of dialogue as a phenomenon of intercultural and educational interaction. It traces the conceptual evolution of dialogue from the classical Socratic model and philosophical hermeneutics to its contemporary interpretations within communicative ethics and cultural education. Drawing on the works of F. Rosenzweig, J. Habermas, K.-O. Apel, and Ukrainian scholars, the study substantiates the principles of dialogical understanding and polydiscursivity as key components in the formation of a tolerant, multicultural, and spiritually oriented educational environment. Particular attention is devoted to the interaction of scientific, philosophical, religious, and educational discourses, which contribute to the development of moral, intellectual, and civic competences. The article argues that intercultural dialogue functions both as a pedagogical method and as a cultural strategy that promotes spiritual growth, social stability, and the harmonization of interreligious and intercultural relations.

Keywords: intercultural dialogue; polydiscursivity; educational discourse; communicative strategy; dialogical education; spiritual development; tolerance.

Баранцова Ірина. Діалогічні стратегії в культурно-освітньому просторі: методологічні засади та міжкультурне розуміння.

У статті досліджено методологічні засади й сутнісні характеристики діалогу як феномена міжкультурної та освітньої взаємодії. Розкрито еволюцію концепції діалогу – від класичної сократівської моделі та філософської герменевтики до сучасного розуміння в контексті комунікативної етики та культурно-освітнього процесу. На основі наукових праць Ф. Розенцвейга, Ю. Габермаса, К.-О. Апеля та українських дослідників обґрунтовано принципи діалогічного розуміння та полідискурсивності як ключових складових формування толерантного багатокультурного й духовно зорієнтованого освітнього середовища. Особливої уваги приділено взаємодії наукового, філософського, релігійного та освітнього дискурсів, які сприяють розвитку моральних, інтелектуальних і громадянських компетентностей. Зроблено висновок, що міжкультурний діалог функціонує як педагогічний метод і як культурна стратегія, спрямована на духовне зростання людини, соціальну стабільність і гармонізацію міжрелігійних та міжкультурних відносин.

Ключові слова: міжкультурний діалог; полідискурсивність; освітній дискурс; комунікативна стратегія; діалогічна освіта; духовний розвиток; толерантність.

Setting the problem. The problem of dialogical understanding as a mode of human existence leading to spiritual growth has been addressed in the works of F. Rosenzweig and other representatives of dialogical philosophy. However, the essential characteristics of dialogue and its transformative potential within the cultural and educational sphere remain insufficiently articulated. In the context of the so-called “knowledge society,” characterized by the rapid transformation of knowledge into flexible information constellations and the primacy of speed over reflective intellectual procedures, dialogue risks

being reduced to superficial communication. Under such conditions, a renewed theoretical justification of the anthropological movement from knowledge as information to intellectual, ethical, and spiritual interaction becomes necessary.

The objective of this article is to identify the core characteristics of intercultural dialogue and to analyze the methodological orientations of communicative processes in the cultural and educational space.

Encyclopedic definitions typically trace the term “dialogue” to its Greek origin and interpret it as

conversation, exchange of remarks, or discussion between two or more participants. Such interpretations, while terminologically accurate, often reduce dialogue to a mere communicative form. Historically, however, dialogue has also functioned as a philosophical genre, a method of seeking truth, and a dialectical procedure aimed at clarifying concepts.

The philosophical development of dialogue – from Socratic maieutics to the dialogical thought of L. Feuerbach, K.-O. Apel, and J. Habermas – significantly enriched its meaning. Within communicative ethics, Habermas conceptualized dialogue as discourse grounded in rational argumentation, mutual recognition, and the search for consensus. Yet the original Socratic orientation toward moral truth and the ethical transformation of the individual remains a crucial reference point.

In contemporary multicultural contexts, dialogical interaction becomes a safeguard against cultural homogenization and the domination of technologically advanced societies over others. Genuine dialogue enables the preservation of cultural identities while fostering mutual enrichment. This is particularly relevant in relation to spiritual values, which have not always been sufficiently integrated into largescale social and educational dialogue (Proleev, 2022, p. 67-82).

In the cultural and educational environment – where scientific, philosophical, religious, and pedagogical discourses intersect – the principle of polydiscursivity acquires special importance. It presupposes that complex phenomena can be adequately understood only at the intersection of diverse communicative practices. Interreligious and intercultural dialogue thus becomes the foundation for multicultural stability and tolerant socialization.

Scientific discourse emphasises rationality, logical coherence, reflexivity, and methodological rigor. It is oriented toward truth, systematic organisation, and the rejection of manipulative techniques. Philosophical discourse, by contrast, is inherently pluralistic and polyphonic, open to diverse epistemological and axiological approaches. Religious discourse introduces moral orientation, spiritual experience, and value-based perspectives. Educational discourse integrates these dimensions, adapting them to pedagogical aims and fostering the development of competences necessary for responsible participation in society.

Educational discourse is not merely a formal system of knowledge transmission; rather, it constitutes a dynamic field in which subjects of education engage in cognitive dialogue. Its principles include creative learning, socialization, personal development, unity of educational space, competence formation, and polydiscursivity. Within this framework, dialogue becomes both a method of

teaching and a strategy for cultivating moral and civic responsibility.

Dialogical strategies should be understood as purpose-oriented systems of communicative actions that translate theoretical principles of dialogue into practical implementation. Any dialogical strategy presupposes motivational, informational-regulatory, operational, productive, and reflexive components. Through these components, dialogue transforms from abstract theory into concrete social practice.

In the modern cultural and educational space – characterised by intensified communication, globalisation, and digital interaction – dialogue extends beyond institutional boundaries. Informal communicative networks shape identities and influence public consciousness. Therefore, dialogical strategies must be conceptually grounded and ethically oriented to prevent simplification, manipulation, or the erosion of value-semantic depth.

Interreligious dialogue represents a particularly complex sphere, as it involves doctrinal differences, historical tensions, and evolving forms of religious self-identification. Nevertheless, peaceful coexistence and cooperation among religious communities demonstrate the civilizational potential of dialogue as a mechanism of reconciliation and mutual understanding (Radionova, 2025, p. 109-114).

The pedagogical dimension of dialogue draws inspiration from the Socratic method of maieutics, which treats dialogue as an art of guiding participants toward self-knowledge and moral insight. Contemporary educational practice may operationalise dialogical understanding through problem-based learning, seminar-dialogues, discussion formats, and interactive digital platforms.

Situations of dialogical understanding involve cognitive, communicative, experiential, and value-semantic components. They require recognition of the legitimacy of alternative viewpoints, openness, emotional engagement, and the use of a shared language accessible to all participants. Through such conditions, dialogue fosters spiritual self-development and the ability to interpret one's own culture in relation to others.

Multicultural dialogue presupposes pluralism, equality, and respect for cultural diversity. It also demands critical reflection on the concept of culture itself – as cultivation, education, and the creation of meanings within specific historical contexts. Without a return to the ethical core of Socratic dialogue and a commitment to human-centered values, intercultural communication risks becoming formalistic or ideologically biased.

Philosophical reflection plays a mediating role in clarifying key concepts such as multicultural dialogue, intercultural education, and dialogical pedagogy. By freeing these notions from stereotypes

and reductive interpretations, philosophy contributes to the deepening of intercultural understanding.

The analysis of the works on intercultural dialogue mentioned above allows us to assert that scientific discourse is primarily oriented toward the rational organisation of communication and its social effectiveness, as well as the identification of ideological contradictions, following these principles:

The principle of cognition, which asserts that the modality of discourse operates within the space of subject-object relations and is evaluated according to the classical concept of truth («true» or «false»), differing from the communicative modality of pragmatic theories of truth («effective» or «ineffective»).

The principle of reflexivity and objectivity, expressed in the rational-conceptual nature of both the communication process and its outcomes, facilitating a transition from ordinary consciousness to rational consciousness during dialogue.

The principle of systematic and organised dialogue, which integrates all levels of human consciousness, including both public and personal spheres.

The principle of high logical culture, involving mastery of formal logic and reasoning rules, opposition to manipulative techniques in communication, and adherence to seriousness, with the inadmissibility of irony concerning sacred or deeply held beliefs.

The principle of objective unity and functional complementarity, based on the understanding that all social institutions, including religion, contribute to the functional integrity of society, reinforcing one another, addressing shared challenges, and striving toward a stable, morally grounded democratic society.

The principle of scientific and historical rigor, which prohibits non-scientific or ahistorical arguments in interreligious dialogue, especially those drawn from questionable sources, whether for a religious audience or the academic community.

The principle of deideologisation, emphasising non-ideological dialogue, avoidance of political manipulation, and resistance to attempts by ideologues to politicise religious consciousness (e.g., concepts of state religion or global religious dominance).

The principle of demythologisation, which seeks to overcome myths, stereotypes, and social-psychological misconceptions—such as beliefs that Islam is inherently aggressive, that women are oppressed there, that Christianity is degenerate, or that polytheism and paganism prevail.

The principle of emotional and psychological support, ensuring that participants experience psychological comfort, empathy, and constructive engagement throughout the dialogue.

From a somewhat different perspective, these authors traditionally trace the tradition of philosophical discourse in dialogue back to antiquity – from the maieutics of Socrates – up to contemporary works by F. Rosenzweig, O. Rosenschtock Hussy, F. Ebner, and others. Unlike scientific or religious discourse, philosophical discourse is fundamentally polyphonic and pluralistic, subjected to diverse epistemological, methodological, and value-oriented approaches that may differ substantially, yet maintain «definitive correctness and logical coherence» (Habermas, 1985, p. 37).

One can agree with this characterisation of discourse, but under certain conditions. First, no discourse can be excluded from dialogue, because the purpose of dialogue is understanding. Discourse is not merely a formal phenomenon; it embodies a particular worldview, a specific attitude toward the world. Therefore, if different perspectives are not articulated in interaction, it becomes impossible to achieve understanding or consensus. Second, discourse reflects the knowledge embedded in each type of worldview, so the plurality of discourses enriches the overall picture of the world. Third, one cannot simultaneously and rapidly teach diverse individuals the best ways to interpret or understand the world.

The content of educational discourse is manifested in the search for and application of cognitive and communicative means that reflect the professional, cultural, and social ideals of education, while shaping professional, socio-cultural, and personal identities. Analysis of the literature allows us to identify the following principles of educational discourse:

The principle of creative learning, which emphasises that while the goal of scientific discourse is the production and systematisation of objectively true knowledge and its practical application, the goal of educational discourse is to transform and transmit this knowledge to younger generations. This involves fostering a creative interest in engaging with knowledge in intellectual and social activities, focusing not only on completeness but also on accessibility for learners.

The principle of socialisation, which ensures the integration of individuals into the broader system of social relations. This is achieved through mastering diverse discursive practices, creating a shared discourse space where targeted socialisation and enculturation occur.

The principle of personal development, based on the recognition that the ideal of the individual is never complete. It emphasises openness to the world and the capacity for creative dialogue and interaction, fostering growth both in the present and in future potential.

The principle of unity of educational space, which recognises the multicultural context of education. Secular and religious educational systems form an integrated whole through the universalisation of scientific knowledge and the differentiation of regional traditions and ethnoconfessional identities.

The principle of educational competence, which encompasses pupils' cognitive, logical, methodological, and social skills. It integrates value-based, cultural, informational, communicative, and religious competences, ensuring the holistic development of students within socio-cultural dialogue.

The principle of active social engagement, which emphasises the participants' voluntary involvement in dialogue, fostering understanding, shared higher values, and participation in collective events.

The principle of polydiscursiveness, which requires mastery of hermeneutics and the ability to interpret diverse linguistic practices – scientific, philosophical, literary, religious, and more – to understand sociocultural traditions. Educational discourse thus plays a crucial role in dialogue, adapting other types of discourse to participants' consciousness and fostering creative self-expression and reflection on the themes of dialogue.

This is how the principle of recognising the monotheistic nature of religion can be applied. First, it should be noted that a complete education cannot be constructed while ignoring the constitutive factors that influence human spirituality. Contemporary global changes increasingly «compress» the cultural space through growing interconnection and interdependence among countries, peoples, and cultures – national, ethnic, gender, political, economic, and religious. At the cultural level, humanity has a vested interest in finding agreement and consensus when addressing controversial issues, in order to prevent the escalation of conflicts and other socially threatening phenomena.

Discourse, derived from the Latin *discere* («to learn» or «to wander»), can be understood as an articulated form – oral or written – of objectifying the content of consciousness, which is shaped by the type of rationality dominant within a given sociocultural tradition (Ukrainian Psychological Explanatory Dictionary, 2006).

Within this framework, intercultural discourse holds a particular advantage, as it represents a higher degree of reflection and comprehension of the dialogue's subject, grounded in philosophical categories and universals. Categories – «the most general concepts of a particular field of knowledge or science» – serve to distill the experience of identifying objective relationships, analyzing and synthesising reality, while universals, which belong to being itself, allow the essence of phenomena under

discussion to be liberated from the denotations and connotations imposed by other discourses.

This situation is particularly evident in the microcosm of human interaction, where judgments, arguments, and conclusions are often offered without formal proof, being evaluated instead against lived experience, traditions, public opinion, personal charisma, and emotional resonance. Such emotional engagement can both enhance the perceived credibility of arguments and, conversely, overshadow the «voice» of rational reasoning.

It should be noted that the active, emotional, and rational relationship between a person and spiritual phenomena – especially in today's world, which, as always, exhibits numerous contradictions, uncertainties, and the impossibility of fully rationally assimilating reality – always engages the horizons of metaphysics and forms of metaphysical thinking, in particular, «the communicative mind in the diversity of its voices».

At the same time, dialogic communication in everyday practice, without the use of heuristic methods for teaching or studying intercultural relations, shifts the focus from the individual to the objective world, from the intelligible to the sensory-emotional sphere. Consequently, situating dialogue within a cultural and educational space becomes necessary.

These issues have gained renewed attention in the context of modernisation, humanisation, and democratisation of education. In today's transition from a purely «educational» paradigm of teaching and upbringing to a culturally oriented paradigm of human development – which integrates multiple discourses as influential factors – the formation of individuals who are spiritually enriched and capable of understanding both their own and others' cultures should be recognized as both a viable and indispensable strategy for dialogic interaction.

Understanding, as a procedure for comprehending or creating meaning, was given categorical status by F. Schleiermacher, who interpreted it as the process of identifying the meaning of a text through interpretation and reconstruction of its original intention. Building on this idea, P. Kendor emphasises that understanding is a method for explicating the question embedded within the text. The classical concept of understanding, in our view, was further developed by W. Windelband, H. Rickert, and other philosophers, whose ideas influenced social theory through M. Weber and V. Dilthey and later found an «existential» continuation in the post-metaphysical thinking of J. Habermas and in contemporary concepts of dialogue.

According to the theories of numerous prominent scholars, the dialogic strategy, in our view, has moved from a primarily social communication plane to the cultural, educational, and spiritual spheres.

This shift has enriched not only the complex and often contradictory process of knowing the world but also the multifaceted human experience, filling life with dialogue and dialogical situations.

At the same time, the potential of dialogue as a means of realising individual subjectivity in cognition and activity – as well as the processes by which humans move from ignorance to understanding and apprehension of metaphysical reality – remains insufficiently grounded in scientific research. Although many contemporary ideas, based on dialogical universals of being, have roots in earlier thought, their systematic assimilation into human consciousness is still incomplete. In this context, philosophical approaches emphasizing the apodictic significance of “understanding” are particularly important.

Consequently, the depth of understanding becomes a key criterion for learning dialogical interaction and for organising dialogue in practice. Any practice, by nature, is historical, manifests in diverse forms, remains open to the external world, and cannot be equated with an absolute entity or substance. Practical relations operate on two fundamental planes:

Object-object plane, where humans transform the world through their actions.

Subject-subject plane, where communication occurs between people in the course of these transformations.

Regardless of the type of activity – economic, religious, or otherwise – humans, as active subjects, continuously reproduce a unity with the object, even when their perspectives differ. This activity can be structured according to procedural components:

Value-motivational, which initiates and directs action. As P. Kendzor notes, «...it is not knowledge that creates a need, but rather the need that leads to cognition, because the subject seeks understanding...» (Kendzor, 2016, p. 67).

Informational and regulatory, encompassing various ideal programs and models of action.

Operational, where motives are translated into concrete physical actions.

Effective, where actions are objectified and acquire a tangible form.

Reflexive evaluation, where goals and outcomes are compared, generating new situations that initiate subsequent cycles of activity.

This cycle produces apperceptive dialogue, which is increasingly common in modern public spaces – spaces of social interaction, such as city markets, which are open to all regardless of sex, race, religion, ethnic origin, age, or socioeconomic status. These are spaces without entrance restrictions, where individuals are not discriminated against based on origin, and where spontaneous dialogical interaction thrives.

Polish professor E. Matinya writes that «...in society, there are moments of protest as well as struggles against imposed forms of behaviour... these protests can be compared to the carnival, along with the temporarily sanctioned disagreements embedded within them». She further notes that «...this volatile sphere of community and dialogue plays a significant role in the emergence of a network of civic attitudes and the revival of the embryonic public sphere». Matinya also suggests several practical insights that can be applied to social and religious practice:

They should be approached locally, grounded in familiar spaces and narratives that help overcome political and cultural separatism and reduce social tension.

One should cultivate readiness to embrace the truth through an ecumenical approach.

Hospitality and generosity should be central to practice, regardless of context.

Epistemologically, attention should be paid to «knowledge with an accent», which can inspire new plans and solutions for divided communities and societies.

Hospitality and openness should be actively practiced to sustain dialogue in all its diversity, embodied in the concept of «civil architecture» – for example, the agora as a space for dialogue, where people who would otherwise never meet come together voluntarily.

Thus, for the sake of achieving a higher level of human interaction – understanding – and to prevent an «era of silence», dialogue serves as a frontier where fragmented aspects of consciousness from different cultures and identities converge. On this frontier, walls of identity can be overcome, competencies of interweaving cultures are cultivated, the ethos of shared borders is promoted, and cities become spaces of interaction among people of different cultures, religions, and ethnic groups. Examples include colloquiums of dialogue, mobile dialogue academies, round tables, word cafés, and religious festivals.

Scientific research on dialogue must, of course, be problem-oriented and object-oriented, both historically and in contemporary contexts. It should first aim to substantiate dialogical strategies, which, through their purpose and mechanisms, facilitate the transition from theory to operational action, from concept to practice. Moreover, this should take place within the cultural and educational space, where educational practices can enact traditional institutions of socialization while translating experience into the design of equal cultural and educational interaction. In such spaces, communication and dialogue function not only as regulators of relationships among objects but also as means of persuading individuals of the necessity of

cooperation, of assimilating fundamental moral and ethical truths, and of enriching personal existence with meaning – integrating individual being with a sense of spiritual integrity.

The analysis of communication and dialogue, understood through communicative and dialogical strategies as important means for individual self-development and the organisation of social relations, highlights the need to examine any activity – including religious activity – through its components, functions, and the conceptual dimension of human action.

Without delving deeply into philosophical and psychological theories of activity as a form of an individual's active engagement with the world to transform it, it is important to note that activity – whose defining characteristic is consciousness – morphologically consists of the subject, motives, goals, actions, operations, and so on, where social actions represent the simplest units of activity. However, an exclusive focus on the morphological aspect, as experience and practice demonstrate, often leads to a fragmented understanding of activity. Its essential characteristics – purposefulness, objectivity, universality, creativity, and general significance – as well as its internal mechanisms, can remain overlooked in analysis and operational practice. In this way, understanding fails to fully account for activities and actions that psychologists define as the purposeful transfer of motion or information from one participant to another (direct – contact, or mediated – distant).

Consequently, in addition to the structural elements of activity previously discussed, functional components should also be considered in constructing dialogical strategies:

Motivational element, which initiates and directs action, encompasses the needs and interests of the subjects.

Informational and regulatory elements, which include various ideal programs and models of action.

Operational element, in which motives are transformed into concrete physical actions, executed with expenditure of energy.

Productive element, where actions are objectified and acquire forms of existence distinct from the subject.

The modern cultural and educational space is characterised by constant expansion, acceleration, and the strengthening of communication ties, as well as their increasing internationalisation. These processes engage more people across diverse cultures, confessions, and communication technologies, facilitating informal dialogue – interaction beyond the direct control of social institutions and shaped by personal representations. Outside the formal structures that regulate social

relations, new social arrangements cultivate a sense of belonging to communities.

Accepting the premise that communication is reflected in strategies and technologies whose implementation serves significant goals and objectives, it should be noted that human actions within socio-cultural choices also display a particular type of language, encompassing meaning, values, and personal preferences. Dialogue in the cultural and educational space functions as a dynamic factor in maintaining balance, ensuring the equal participation of individuals, and preventing conflict, destabilization, and social entropy.

Everyday dialogical communication, when detached from philosophical or scientific frameworks, often risks reducing human activity and may even hinder productive modes, methods, and techniques of interaction. Understanding the world and other people continually presents new challenges, requiring the revision of prior assumptions. Conceptual constructs enable individuals to navigate the world of objects, performing logical operations and interpreting them to achieve mutual understanding.

This dynamic becomes particularly evident in communicative and dialogical strategies, which involve a broad range of participants in the cultural and educational space, including students, teachers, researchers, leaders of cultural and educational institutions, representatives of government and local authorities, political parties, religious and confessional organisations, public and national-cultural movements, and mass media.

The recognition of dialogue through the principle of theoretical and methodological support for religious practices within a particular cultural and educational space, specifically, the peoples of the North Azov region – requires the development of conceptual foundations for dialogical strategies. A central aspect of these developments should be the justification of the theory and methodology of discursive dialogue, in which religious discourse is integrated alongside other forms of discourse. Moreover, this integration should occur within the framework of general cultural dialogue, as well as interreligious and confessional communication.

Interreligious communication occurs across multiple spheres of human life. In the socio-political sphere, dialogue takes place between political and social leaders of countries and religious communities, as well as between societal structures and organisations. In the socio-cultural sphere, it involves interaction between different religious, social, and cultural institutions, mass media, communities, and civic groups, facilitating mutual understanding among representatives of cultural identities, including religious, educational, and cultural identities. In everyday life, it manifests

through interpersonal relations, where positions of individuals from various denominations are mediated by lived experience.

The complexity of dialogue in this context is further compounded by the variability of relations among the newest religious movements. In their initial stages, such movements often display uncompromising condemnation of secular authority and refuse contact with the «sinful world». Leaders unable to maintain this «fortress-like» isolation eventually withdraw from society. Transitions toward more compromise-oriented engagement typically take the form of a quiet abandonment of previous rigid declarative positions.

Thus, the interaction of scientific, philosophical, educational, and religious discourse clarifies the specificity of educational models for interreligious dialogue and their contemporary prospects. Dialogue is becoming increasingly relevant, especially in recent decades with the expansion of modern communications, which has enabled greater interaction between adherents of major religions. The peaceful coexistence of religions today demonstrates the civilizational potential of religious peacemaking, highlights the historical significance of interreligious peacekeeping models in a globalizing world, and provides individuals with the opportunity to engage with the richness of national and world cultures while contributing to societal stability.

It is in this way, according to the authors, the process of spiritual self-improvement of oneself as a unique individuality (component of goal setting) takes place. Thanks to the cognitive component of the situation of the dialogic understanding, a man directs himself to the knowledge of himself, his spiritual capabilities (the component of experience), the communicative component manifests itself and develops in dialogue, in interaction and is based on the understanding of oneself through the other and the other through oneself (the component of awareness), and the content contributes the realization of spiritual self-development, the transformation of the world on the principles of spirituality (a component of meaning and praxis).

In various directions of modernization of higher education, the implementation of the idea of dialogue becomes widespread in the purposefulness, content, organizational and managerial conditions of education. A significant part of teachers pays attention to the analysis of cultural and educational practices, the implementation of active methods and methods of dialogue education (integration of the principles of problem, variability in the educational process, modeling and implementation of didactic and cognitive means of learning, various forms and methods of teaching – problem lecture, dialogue micro-research, binary lecture, seminar-dialogue, lecture-discussion, internet dialogue, etc.).

The most expressive of the specifics of cultural preferences in the educational process is the religious discourse, in dialogue with which its principles are viewed: religious traditionalism; recognition of the monotheistic nature of religion; freedom of religion; recognition of the need for social cooperation for the benefit of society; moral unity and orientation of the participants in the dialogue on spirituality; the principle of peaceful coexistence on the basis of the treaty; the principle of confessional identity; the principle of anti-globalisation and others.

Shifting research from the methodological and general level to the practical level requires recalling the extensive pedagogical experience of managing dialogue, known as maieutics. Socrates is recognised as its founder, who endowed dialogue not only with dialectical, logical, and value-oriented dimensions, but also with the art of directing it toward human and moral consensus. The «master plan» for the deployment of dialogue can be seen as a guiding framework, akin to a «paternal grandmother», for seeking consensus in human relations. In cultural and educational practices, these ideas have been effectively implemented by Ukrainian scholars and practitioners.

In our view, the approach closest to maieutics is the creation and resolution of specific pedagogical and dialogical situations, as emphasized by contemporary researchers such as M. Boritko. They define a pedagogical situation as a particular life event for the student that presents significant opportunities for spiritual development. Since the problems of spiritual life are primarily problems of understanding, the situation in which a student's interest in the outside world, other people, and themselves, is realised must be grounded in understanding and self-understanding.

The theoretical and methodological foundation of dialogical understanding is rooted in several intellectual traditions:

Phenomenology of consciousness, emphasising the semantic life of experience (E. Husserl, E. Fink, V. Frankl).

Philosophical hermeneutics, exploring the essence of understanding and self-understanding (H.-G. Gadamer, G. Dilthey, P. Rickert, F. Schleiermacher).

Reflexive philosophy, addressing human orientation toward self and others during interaction (G. Hegel, R. Descartes, I. Kant).

Existentialism, conceptualising humans as unified, dynamically actualized beings (Jean-Paul Sartre, M. Heidegger, Karl Jaspers).

Philosophy of culture, which situates dialogue within broader cultural and value contexts.

The logic of constructing dialogical understanding situations involves categorising each

type of situation. Information situations can be further divided into:

- Ethical or controversial tasks,
- Ethical dilemmas,
- Valuable interpretations by dialogue participants,
- Comparisons of self and other,
- Identification of another's life meanings,
- Exploration of life purpose and ways to assist others.

In constructing these situations, we advocate for a cognitive progression aligned with intellectual development: «ignorance of ignorance», «knowledge of ignorance», «knowledge of knowledge», complemented by a value-semantic and praxeological framework for understanding, mutual understanding, and interpreting the progress of humanity.

The creation of dialogical understanding situations should adhere to the following principles:

- a) Recognition of the legitimacy of differing viewpoints;
- b) Openness and receptivity;
- c) Demonstration of both the uniqueness and commonality of human beings;
- d) The teacher's response to information from the interlocutor should be non-evaluative;
- e) Creation of an emotional environment conducive to self-discovery and exploration of one's inner world;
- f) Use of a common language understood by all participants.

Recently, within educational discourse, the concept of language has increasingly been associated with polydiscursivity – the mastery of diverse linguistic practices (scientific, philosophical, literary, religious, etc.) to achieve an adequate understanding of sociocultural traditions. In such a dialogue, representatives of various discourses strive to establish a common, or at least transparent and comprehensible, language as the basis for mutual understanding. Dialogue here is not only verbal but also involves interpreting the motives and intentions of the speaker. This process fosters a culture of «assimilators», enabling individuals to integrate into the cultural environment and to assess complex or controversial situations from the perspective of other cultures.

Such an educational discourse can function effectively if it operates within the cultural and educational space as a continuum uniting science and education, education and culture, and the personal educational programs of participants with institutional frameworks. Ideally, the creation, transmission, and acquisition of knowledge should correspond to its semantic depth and meaning. Without philosophical enrichment, however, the educational process often remains confined to a mere educational environment. Ukrainian scholar

N. Radionova emphasizes the role of philosophy in transforming the educational space functionally.

At first glance, especially in non-humanitarian universities, achieving the goals of dialogue and communication may seem unrealistic, since discourses often reveal not only contradictory perspectives but also fundamentally opposing positions. Yet the recognition and comprehension of these contradictions constitute the first step toward the peaceful coexistence of cultural identities, each with its own experience of peacemaking.

Consequently, dialogue as a form of humanitarian technology should guide educational discourses toward fostering a dialogue of cultures and orienting them toward philosophical reflection. It is philosophical reflection that gives substantive meaning to concepts such as «multicultural dialogue», «intercultural dialogue», «dialogue education», and «multicultural education», clarifying their definitions and freeing them from stereotyped, falsified, or quasi-intellectual interpretations.

Summarising the specificity of philosophy, J. Deleuze and F. Guattari emphasised that «Philosophy is neither mere contemplation, which simply reflects things, nor reflection arising from simple reasoning (this understanding diminishes its significance). Philosophy cannot be reduced to communication that merely works with thoughts to reach consensus. The path of these philosophical universals has already been traversed...» (Guattari, 1998, p. 14). They also stated: «We are not responsible for the victims, but guilty for the victims».

Therefore, it is impossible to deepen multicultural dialogue or expand its context – even using the rationally impartial approaches of J. Habermas, V. Schmidt, or V. Gosle – if the following conditions are not met:

A return to the Socratic understanding of dialogue;

Grounding multiculturalism in pluralism and the recognition of equality and equal rights for all ethnic, social, political, age, religious, and confessional groups, without permitting discrimination based on membership;

Expanding dialogue to examine the essence of the concept of «culture» (Latin *cultura* – cultivation, education, development, mastery) beyond its literal meaning to include the totality of methods, techniques, and meanings of human life, as well as material and spiritual achievements within specific socio-historical contexts;

Finally, a return to Socratic morality and human philosophy, recognising the human dimension of intercultural dialogue as a criterion of culture and as a vehicle for self-improvement, fidelity to cultural values, and the moral development of the individual – objectives central to Socrates' vision.

These positions are reflected in the work of the author of the monograph as well as in the writings of other scholars.

Conclusion. The study has demonstrated that dialogical strategies in the cultural and educational space function not only as communicative tools but also as methodological foundations for intercultural understanding and spiritual development. The integration of scientific, philosophical, educational, and religious discourses within a polydiscursive framework ensures a deeper level of mutual comprehension and promotes tolerance in multicultural societies.

Intercultural dialogue, grounded in the principles of reflexivity, openness, equality, and ethical responsibility, becomes an essential pedagogical and cultural mechanism for preventing conflicts and fostering social cohesion. The implementation of dialogical strategies in educational practice contributes to the formation of morally responsible, intellectually mature, and culturally sensitive individuals capable of constructive interaction in a globalized world.

Thus, dialogical interaction should be regarded as a key methodological orientation for contemporary cultural and educational development.

References

- Kendzor, P. I. (2016). *Integration through dialogue: The system of organizing multicultural education at school* [Monograph]. Lviv, Ukraine: Panorama Publishing, 378 pp. Retrieved from: https://lib.iitta.gov.ua/id/eprint/707745/1/Kendzer_dis.pdf
- Proleev, S. (2022). Sociocultural foundations of discourse and transformation of modernity. *Philosophical thought*. P. 67-82 <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2022.02.067>
- Radionova, N. V. (2025). *Transversality of nonverbal communication in the media space: behind the scenes of the «art of living» of modern man*. *Humanities studies: Collection of Scientific Papers*. 2024. 20 (97). Pp. 109–114. doi: <https://doi.org/10.32782/hst-2024-20-97-12>
- Ukrainian Psychological Explanatory Dictionary / V. M. Korporulin (Ed.). (2006). Kharkiv, Ukraine: Fakty, 400 p., p. 69. Retrieved from: <https://archive.org/details/psycholoh2007>
- Habermas, J. (1985). *Rückkehr zur Metaphysik: Eine Tendenz in der deutschen Philosophie*. *Merkur*, 39 (9–10), 898–905. Retrieved from: <https://www.merkur-zeitschrift.de/juergen-habermas-rueckkehr-zur-metaphysik/>
- Habermas, J. (1981). *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*, Bd. 2. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Suhrkamp, 348 s. Retrieved from: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-658-37354-2_22
- Hosle, V. (2006). *Der Philosophische Dialog: Eine Poetik und Hermeneutik*. München, Germany: C. H. Beck Verlag, 494 s. Retrieved from: <https://www.chbeck.de/hoesle-philosophische-dialog/product/13698>
- Guattari, F., & Deleuze, J. (1998). *What is philosophy?* (Qu'est-ce que la philosophie?) New York: Columbia University Press. ISBN 978-0231079891. Retrieved from: https://www.Was-Philosophie-suhrkamp-taschenbuch-wissenschaft/dp/3518290835/ref=monarch_sidesheet_title#

Список використаних джерел

- Кендзор П. І. (2016). *Інтеграція через діалог. Система організації полікультурного виховання в школі*: монографія. Львів: Видавництво «Панорама». 378 с. URL: https://lib.iitta.gov.ua/id/eprint/707745/1/Kendzer_dis.pdf
- Пролєєв С. (2022). Соціокультурні підвалини дискурсу та трансформації сучасності. *Філософська думка*. С. 67-82. URL: <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2022.02.067>
- Радіонова Н. В. (2025). *Трансверсальність неєрбальної комунікації у медіапросторі: за лаїтунками «мистецтва жити» сучасної людини*. *Humanities studies: Collection of Scientific Papers*. 2024. 20 (97). Pp. 109–114. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/hst-2024-20-97-12>
- Український психологічний тлумачний словник. (2006). / авт. В. М. Корпорулін. Харків: Факти. 400 с. URL: <https://archive.org/details/psycholoh2007>
- Habermas J. (1985). *Rückkehr zur Metaphysik. Eine Tendenz in der deutschen Philosophie*. In: *Merkur*, H.439/440, 898 s. Retrieved from: <https://www.merkur-zeitschrift.de/juergen-habermas-rueckkehr-zur-metaphysik/>
- Habermas J. (1981). *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*. Bd. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 348 s. Retrieved from: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-658-37354-2_22
- Hosle V. (2006). *Der Philosophical Dialogue Eine Poetik und Hermeneutik*. München, Verlag C.H.BeckoHg, 2006. 494 s. Retrieved from: <https://www.chbeck.de/hoesle-philosophische-dialog/product/13698>
- Guattari F. (1998). *What is philosophy?* (Qu'est-ce que la philosophie?) New York: Columbia University Press. ISBN 978-0231079891. Retrieved from: https://www.Was-Philosophie-suhrkamp-taschenbuch-wissenschaft/dp/3518290835/ref=monarch_sidesheet_title#

Information about the author:

Barantsova Iryna Oleksandrivna
irinabarantsova25@gmail.com
Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State
Pedagogical University
Scientific Town, Street 59, Zaporizhzhia,
Zaporizhzhia region, 69000, Ukraine

Відомості про автора:

Баранцова Ірина Олександрівна
irinabarantsova25@gmail.com
Мелітопольський державний педагогічний
університет імені Богдана Хмельницького
Наукове містечко, вулиця 59, Запоріжжя,
Запорізька обл. 69000, Україна

Received at the editorial office 17. 02. 2026.

Accepted for publishing 14. 03. 2026.

Матеріал надійшов до редакції 17. 02. 2026 р.

Прийнято до друку 14. 03. 2026 р.