

Dialogue in the Philosophical and Educational Postmodern View

Halyna ZHUKOVA¹,
Olha VASHEVICH²,
Oksana PATLAICHUK³,
Tetiana SHVETS⁴,
Nataliia TORCHYNSKA⁵,
Iryna MAIDANIUK⁶

¹ National University of Ukraine on Physical Education and Sport, Kyiv, Ukraine, galinazh1299@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1248-4669>

² Mykhailo Boichuk Kyiv State Academy of Decorative Applied Arts and Design, Kyiv, Ukraine, kolle_a@ukr.net, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1936-7342>

³ Admiral Makarov National University of Shipbuilding, Mykolaiv, Ukraine, volnistik@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1448-3360>

⁴ Private school Athens in Kyiv, Ukraine, shvets@athens.kiev.ua, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9713-7817>

⁵ Khmelnytskyi National University, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, natatora@ukr.net, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6182-0027>

⁶ National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, mira-i@ukr.net

Abstract: The article analyses the modern assimilations of the definition ‘dialog’ and its rendering by the world academic community. Attention is drawn to the exceptional empirical significance of dialogics as a general scientific universal. The etymology of dialogue as a key category of philosophical, educational and pedagogical knowledge is identified. The evolution of the lead notionists’ ideas about the kernel and nature of dialogue that are relevant of the humanity itself, human mind and constant search of true knowledge is studied. A parallel is drawn between Socratic dialogue and dialogue in the postmodern educational and philosophic discourse. The problem of the antique thinkers’ understanding of dialogue is studied discretely. The contemporary approaches to the fundamentals of dialogism, as outlined in the works of the lead theorists, are studied from the antiqueness to these days. It is highlighted how relevant and applicable for educational philosophy of the XXI century ‘G. Skovoroda’s dialogues’ are. It is ascertained that setting dialogue as autonomous subject of research of a particular school of thought reaches the works of L. Feuerbach with its thesis origins, but gets its final formulization in the works of M. Buber. The author dwells on the main theses of the approach of M. Bakhtin about the dialogic sources of the human beingness. The content and scope of the concepts ‘dialogical pedagogics’, ‘interactive dialogue’, ‘egalitarian dialogue’ are analysed. The advantages and disadvantages of the idea ‘knowledge building’ are studied. It is accentuated that the origins of many contemporary dialogue theories and methodologies date back to the ancient times and represent the attempts to integrate the ‘Socratic dialogue’ into the postmodern discourse. The state of adaptedness and conformance of the contemporary theories of dialogue to challenges of digitalisation and globalisation of the postmodern educational-philosophical space is studied.

Keywords: *Professional training, higher education institutions, improvement of educational process, postmodern art, competence, creative development, interdisciplinarity.*

How to cite: Zhukova, H., Vashevich, O., Patlaichuk, O., Shvets, T., Torchynska, N., Maidaniuk, I. (2022). Dialogue in the Philosophical and Educational Postmodern View. *Postmodern Openings*, 13(2), 303-320. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.2/455>

Introduction

The current processes in the spiritual, cultural, socio-political and, most importantly, digital beingness of the human being in the XXI century are marked with two complementary, equally influential and powerful tendencies that they superficially seem to be antagonistic, but at the same time they coexist not only organically but also complement and imbue one another. Principally, one means the activation of global and digital processes that seem to 'blur' the long-established philosophical and educational boundaries making it possible to reach a qualitatively new communicative level in establishing and conducting a dialogue. It should be remembered that the said transformations proceed in the context of global postmodern discoursiveness and, of course, specifications in terms of national codes. Due to the multicultural environments where a human being lives and function, another tendency complicates the communicative component of dialogue with the polyvector realms and unlimited variety of interactions at different levels.

On the one hand, the global community, having discovered 'a digital Pandora's box', acquired an unlimited interspace of information and knowledge that would be better to call a metaspace. When a human being enters or interacts with it is a fact of realisation of postmodern polydiscourse dialogue itself. On the second hand, the said dialogue concurrently assumes new and novel features, as, firstly, it becomes depersonalised to some extent and correspondingly estranged from the traditional representation of a subject-subject interpersonal communicative interaction, and, secondly, it is marked with general access to the opportunity to establish communication with somebody whenever and wherever by electronic means, what makes the selection process longer and more complex, as it was multiply affirmed by history, and somewhat retards and respectively defers the actual establishment of efficient communication and a productive dialogue as a result.

It should be pointed out that scholars started drawing similar conclusions quite a long time ago. For instance, as far back as 2013 Zelenkina (2013), studying 'The Dialogue with a Stranger in the Postmodern Model of Human Beingness, remarked that 'the communication process has ceased to be a dialogue between You and I' and 'an open 'face-to-face' dialogue has turned into a dialogue of partially depersonalised subjects, as a person cannot receive such non-verbal information like gestures, intonation, body language during the communication' (Zelenkina, 2013, p. 94). The appropriateness of a thesis of the researcher of academic philosophical ideas is hardly

doubtful, as well as it is unreasonable to controvert some further activation of the recapped phenomena.

From this perspective, dialogue in general and dialogics of the philosophical-educational space in the context of contemporary postmodern paradigms are genuinely interesting both for fixing and analysing particular components and a complex understanding of this phenomenon. The relevance of this work is also related to special specifications assumed by the term 'dialogue', i.e. receptions and variations, influencing the drift of attributes of its definition caused by a person's being in an endless interdiscourse permanently accelerated flow of information and knowledge. The urgency and demand for a proposed exploration, as much as anything else, result from the lack of complex scientific works where dialogue in the philosophical and educational view would be an autonomous object studied.

In view of the foregoing, the purpose of this article is to study contemporary academic approaches to the definition and representation of the phenomenon of dialogue in the context of philosophical-educational postmodern discourse. For this reason, the object under study is postmodern receptions of dialogue in the representations by the global and national researchers of philosophical-educational ideas. The purpose and specifics of the object under study lead to the selection of appropriate sources on the problematics set. The main criterion in this aspect is the credibility of publications and an academic nature of surveys included in the analysis. An additional point is that special attention is drawn to interdisciplinary scientific texts giving grounds not only for making sporadic conclusions or registering concurrent tendencies but for pushing on to the level of general scientific generalisations.

Origins of dialogue as general scientific universal in the present assimilation

Coming to the problem of dialogics through the philosophical-educational spectacle in general and postmodern in particular, it should be understood that the term 'dialogue' is an academic universal in fact. A sound experience of specialised understanding of both the definition and its determination from the ancient times to the present days has been gained.

The global academia shares the one view that one of the first was the ancient philosopher Socrates who focused on this problematics (Peterson, 2011). It is hard to controvert the thesis that not only do the figure of the philosopher and his conceptual idea of dialogue not become irrelevant but,

on the contrary, attract even more attention of researchers. For instance, the said tendency was also noted by Bespalov (2019) who associated an increased interest of scholars with the fact that Socrates' pursuance of truth through questions and answers to them had a great impact on the philosophical thought and education methodology: 'If we recall on "the Socratic dialogues"', we will ascertain without any problem that namely Socrates created a language of the European philosophy in many aspects. The dialogic form or thinking, discourse are not only at the core of the Socratic philosophy but also any real, successful philosophy' (Bespalov, 2019, p. 36). The viewpoint of Pukhyr (2018) is similar. He tried both to direct the Socratic dialogics to a contemporary educational-philosophical space and to study it in conjunction with an ethic, axiological, conceptual and practical components: 'The ethical representation by Socrates is abundant for discussing the problems of morality basing not that much on mystical revelations but on a rational consideration of the central ethical concepts. <...> Every so often, after reading and discussing the dialogues of Socrates... young persons go through some positive adjustment of the system of values. <...> Learning the dialogues of Socrates develops skills to obtain connotations from them. <...> It is particularly important to communicate to students that the dialogues of Socrates were inextricably linked to practice' (Pukhyr, 2018, pp. 51-52). We aver that dialogue can be justifiably qualified on the grounds of the said commentaries as one of the root elements of the present educational-philosophical conceptual ideas. As rightly noted by Nefedchenko (2017), the name of Socrates and his dialogue method should be also considered as a primary source of the contemporary heuristic education (Nefedchenko, 2017). Hence, the ideas of dialogics of the philosophical-educational space postulated then by Socrates and reflected by the sophists and academia till nowadays are actually not only an object but also both a basis and instrumentarium for activities in the philosophical and scientific-educational fields.

The ideas of Socrates about dialogics and its nature were extended and peculiarly systemised in the works of ancient Greek sophists (Xenophon, 1994). Krutii (2013) made a pertinent observation, '...proceeding from whichever ideas of Socrates, Plato does not simply elaborate or extend them but also creates an original integral philosophical system that has been remaining relevant so far. Therefore, whoever could Plato confront or agree with in his dialogues, he has a constant inner discourse with himself, first of all, being in a continuous state of pursuance of truth, which never ends' (Krutii, 2013, p. 152). In this context, as deemed by the author, philosophy

itself is equalled to dialogue reflecting the nature of human thinking aimed at learning the truth. Besides, we can find alike ideas in the work of Skovoroda (1973), a distinguished Ukrainian sophist, who for the essence of the concept 'dialogue' evolves in the pursuance of truth. Therefore, the parallels between the dialogues of Socrates and Plato suggest themselves as such, mainly referring to the ethical realm of problems. Troitska, (2017) drew a significant inference in this respect that 'the dialogics of G. Skovoroda – "Ukrainian Socrates" – can be appropriate for comprehending the ideological-anthropological aspects of the modern pedagogical theory and practice, particularly in the explication of the cultural-educational space of a person that has not drawn proper attention to itself yet in philosophy' (Troitska, 2017, p. 54). Thus, despite the arduous discussions regarding the name of Socrates and different aspects of his philosophy, the problems of Skovoroda's dialogics in terms of the postmodern discourse of the education philosophy have not been studied so far, which we deem a perspective and extremely important, empirically first of all, aspect. Projecting the philosopher's ideas on the postmodern space is potentially capable to solve a number of philosophical-pedagogical tasks of the interpersonal interaction.

Concurrently, Karavaeva (2020) studies the educational and outreach components of dialogue in the comparative way by comparing and contraposing selected theses stated in the works of Plato and Xenophon in her work 'A Word and A Deed in "The Memorabilia" by Xenophon', and draws an inference about reasonableness to operate the concept 'Socratic discourse' along with and in connexion with the term 'Socratic dialogue'. In terms of the latter, the researcher completely agrees with an opinion of her foreign colleague Johnson (2005), differentiates three types of dialogue of Socrates in the assimilation of Xenophon: elenchus 'ἔλεγχος [a logical refutation], didactic discourse and elenchus with a discourse... Moreover, elenchus as main strategy to hold dialogues of Socrates of Plato is considered by Xenophon only as a part of the general educational strategy, which is not advantageous for everyone and does not always lead to chastity. Basically, it is not enough to have only elenchus in education. There are other more productive didactic ways of education: it is enough to show certain people where to move to and not to criticise them on their way (Karavaeva, 2020, p. 222). Summarising the aforementioned facts, one should make a note of a complementary relationship of dialogue in the philosophical and educational paradigms that was set by the ancient Greek philosophers and is synthesised

within the education philosophy but does not exhaust the polyaspect and somewhere contradictory nature of dialogics.

Dialogics in the educational-philosophical conceptual ideas of the Modern Age: on the way to postmodernity

The intensification of attempts to make global progress in the field of academic understanding of dialogue undoubtedly dates back to the early nineteenth century and is associated, in particular, with the name of the founder of general linguistics and philosophy of language, Humboldt (1828).

Defending the dialogic nature of language, the scholar points to the existence of unchanging dualism in the very essence of language and the realisation of speech through question-answer, in fact through dialogue (Humboldt, 1828). These conclusions of Humboldt (1828) are the basis of the dialogical concept of 'I-You', according to which duality is primarily inherent in human consciousness. In this context, analysing the main provisions of Humboldt's theory, Shashkova and Zolochevskaia (2011) note that the problematics of dialogue is currently 'developing within two main areas according to which aspect of dialogue is particularly emphasised – informative or personal', and add that 'the founder of the first approach was Socrates, and the second approach originates from L. Feuerbach' (Shashkova & Zolochevskaia, 2011, p. 44). It is, obviously, the thesis of Feuerbach (1841) that the real dialectics is not a monologue of a lone thinker with himself, but a dialogue between I and You (Feuerbach, 1841). Comparing and contraposing the ideas of L. Feuerbach and F. Dostoyevsky, Kazakov (2012) specifies that 'the philosophical conceptual idea of Feuerbach cannot be considered <...> dialogic <...> – the philosopher can be actually named only as precursor of dialogism. The architectonic nature of the view of The Other <...> is not considered by Feuerbach' (Kazakov, 2012). It is difficult to disagree with the points of the researcher. Therefore, it should be pointed out that modelling dialogue scholarly as an autonomous subject of research of a certain philosophical aspect originates in the theses, works of L. Feuerbach, and it is finally modelled, as determined by the scholars (Górzna, 2014) in the works of Buber (1937).

Summarizing the content of the philosophical searches of the philosopher, it can be stated that this is an internal line of action in dialogue (interaction), which can occur outside the verbal communicative components, i.e. not limited to communication, and is the attitude of people to each other, manifested in communication (Buber, 1937). In view of this, his

assumption differentiates between real, technical and monologue dialogue, which formally takes the form of dialogue (Buber, 1937). As Kovalchuk (2017) aptly noted, Martin Buber carries out this classification not on the basis of the division of dialogue in its understanding, but on the technical basis of how people communicate, i.e. here any communication between two people is considered to be a dialogue both at the personal and individual levels. A real dialogue or relationship, as the philosopher called it, takes place in people and between people, it is not just communication, but the presence of two in the interpersonal and speechless (Kovalchuk, 2017, p. 20).

In terms of the historical foray into the evolution of dialogics, Bakhtin (1997, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2008, 2010) should be mentioned. A while ago, clearly differentiating the academic and mundane plains of the assumption of dialogue, he insisted on the universality of the last mentioned, that human beingness is based on it, and it accompanies all the components of his life meaning that it is a peculiar key to understanding. 'It is impossible to invade an inner human, to see and understand him making him to be a subject of a remote neutral analysis. It is also impossible to invade him by entwining with him, living through him. No. It is possible to get to and reveal him, being more exact, to make him reveal himself independently only by communicating with him, dialogically...' (Bakhtin, 2002 p. 280). As can be seen, dialogue is not only and that much a way of communication, but it is more a potent instrument of self-reflection and studying of another human, being intrinsically an organic and essential stage of various communication forms. Interestingly, it is increasingly frequent that scholars turn to the theory of dialogue of M. Bakhtin (Bakhtin, 1997, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2008, 2010) nowadays as to an initial point in researching various aspects of the education philosophy and pedagogics. The tendency observed may be absolutely natural and anticipated, as specialists from all over the world are interested now in various aspects of the postmodern reality, and M. Bakhtin, as Professor Volkov (2015) convincingly proves, is a forerunner of postmodernism, and the dialogue theory of Bakhtin is now read and interpreted in different fields of humanitaristics in a novel way. It is about dialogue with chaos, as observed by Yachmeniova (2005), as 'a new philosophical strategy that is key for understanding self-regulation secrets of chaos that directs to look for harmony internally, not in chaos is now in the postmodern aesthetics' (Yachmeniova, 2005, p. 210). It is obvious and clear as such that both the education philosophy and pedagogics presently focus on the problems of harmonisation through dialogue.

Dialogue as a central category of the postmodern conceptual ideas of the education philosophy

The bipolar tendencies of the modern world, which are clearly represented and progressing today, on the one hand, due to multiculturalism caused by globalization and digitalization transformations, contribute to the expansion of the communicative field of both individuals and entire ethnic groups. On the other hand, there is a problem of improving the effectiveness of these interactions, which is undoubtedly one of the key principles of postmodernism, which aims to destroy various etymologies of human boundaries, including communication (Nerubasska, Palshkov, & Maksymchuk, 2020; Nerubasska, Maksymchuk, 2020). From the time of Socrates to the present day, dialogue has remained the only instrument for maintaining interactions through the duality inherent in the human nature. Thus, it is in fact a central category of the anthropologically concentrated knowledge. In this regard, Troitska (2017) draws attention to the fact that ‘the problem of dialogue in education has acquired some significant reflection in the anthropologically oriented philosophy, which conceptually reproduces the image of Homo educandus in the goals, content, organizational and managerial conditions and technologies of the educational process, and adds significant anthropological substantiations of the nature, essence, character and properties of man’ (Troitska, 2017, p. 53). It is difficult to disagree with the researcher's opinion, because the educational component in both its formal, particularly academic and informal manifestations occupies a significant part of the human life and is possible only through dialogue in the broadest sense of the term, which, in turn, is an organic manifestation of specific internal human parameters. Touching upon the problems of today's dialogue from anthropologically oriented positions, Kozlova (2020) comes to an interesting conclusion: ‘Philosophical anthropology in tandem with the philosophy of education is designed to mitigate the negative effects of globalization, technological boom, permanent situation of choice, to teach to adequately interpret the beingness and to find harmony in an extremely changing world. The interaction of philosophical anthropology and philosophy of education mutually enrich both directions, gives rise to a dialogue of sectoral philosophies’ (Kozlova, 2020, p. 14). As evident, it is referred to the exclusive integration of contemporary philosophical knowledge based on dialogue as an act of communicative, social, cultural, educational and some other interactions, ‘provoked’ by contemporary postmodern realities on the one hand, but stated as a marker and integral component of the latter.

Given the interactivity as a dominant parameter of the digitalized present, the words of an American expert, Burbules (1996), on the anti-dialogic nature of society and, consequently, educational space as a kind of its mirror model, society seem reasonable therefore to be studied through macrocosm in this case, and educational space – through microcosm. We return to the above idea of the direct dependence of dialogics on a degree of globalization: the more active the latter, the less productive in the most general sense becomes the dialogue. Hence, endeavours of theorists and practitioners of the education philosophy and pedagogics should centre on returning to the initially common to the human nature dialogics, what is possible through the heuristic activities and transformation of a monologue reproductive process into a dialogical cognitive interaction, according to Burbules (1996). From these considerations, dialogue is not a simple subject-subject communicative-cognitive act, but engagement of intellectual, moral realms first of all. The article by Siryk (2011) provides an interesting observation in this respect. The researcher studies the concept ‘dialogical pedagogics in terms of the American educational-philosophical discourse, interactive dialogics of Burbules (1996) in particular, and draws an inference that ‘global education and global educational practices as a polylogue, where information transforms into life senses, requires responsibility both in selecting its content and influencing people being in intercultural and pedagogical relationships at the same time. <...> The dialogical thinking and dialogical behaviour become essential for the informational society that is a communicative society of global networks. Considering this postmodern tendency, dialogical pedagogics expands its horizons and problem field. <...> Dialogical pedagogics becomes one of the fundamentals of ‘global education’ conceptualised as ‘education in the global society’ (Siryk, 2011, p. 71). It could be assumed that it is referred to globalisation through dialogue in this case, i.e. establishment and maintenance of metadiological practices including cognitive, linguistic, ethical etc. dialogical components.

‘Dialogical pedagogics’, as mentioned in the paper by Siryk (2011) is one of the dominant conceptual ideas of the education philosophy and pedagogics now, the prominent theorists of which are Matusov and Lemke (2015). The principal concepts of Ye. Matusov are critical exploration of yourself and a surrounding world through an instrumental or ontological dialogue (Matusov, Lemke, 2015). It is referred to either real verbal communication, educational strategy and efficient implementation of the educational process, if an instrumental dialogue is meant, or a philosophical-

pedagogical category based on the ideas of Bakhtin (1997, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2008, 2010) and Buber (1937) about dialogue as a natural form of existence of an individual, if it is referred to an ontological approach. Understanding a rather comprehensive and laconic differentiation of the aforementioned tactics of Ye. Matusov (Matusov, Lemke, 2015), carried out by Gvaldin (2017), it should be noted that an instrumental dialogue assists in preparing for life, whereas an ontological dialogue is this life that is essentially learning.

The global educational and pedagogical scientific communities do not ignore the problematics of dialogic philosophy of education in South America thanks to the world-famous Brazilian psychologist and educator Freire (1987), who for the pedagogical process and education are dialogue. In this context, in our opinion, the concepts of Freire (1987) resonate with the well-known biblical truth that the Word was in the beginning. Thus, the Word, according to Freire (1987), requires a responsible attitude, because it enables a dialogical practice, which, in turn, allows a person to learn not only the world around him or another person, but also himself in the first place. Indeed, the educational process in this interpretation should be built on the basis of dialogue as an efficient instrument for exploring broader cognitive and communicative horizons and learning deeper and more complex truths. Kokhan (2018) draws similar inferences, even though they are somehow otherwise formulated. In his article 'Paulo Freire and 'Philosophy for Children': Critical Dialogue' dedicated to the academic reflections on the psychological and pedagogical works of Freire (1987) and Lipman (1991), dialogical learning is rendered as an alternative to estrangement that has been mentioned above: 'When students learn through a dialogical process, a teacher also learn from them, and they teach a teacher in turn. They learn to treat themselves, their teacher and mates as equal; they realise the importance of learning with the equals, as opposed to the model when those who are lower learn from those who are higher in the hierarchy. They start perceiving education as an egalitarian, cooperative and democratic form of social life' (Kokhan, 2018, p. 62). It is interesting that the conceptual idea of an egalitarian dialogue was considered by Freire (1987) as a component of the peremptory progressive postmodern worldview stance. It is difficult to disagree with such an interpretation, despite all the unusual wording, because postmodernism in fact levels not only the boundaries of mass / elitist or high / low, but 'blurs' the boundaries between any antagonistic concepts or phenomena; and in our case, Freire (1987) destroys the teacher-student opposition, a dialogue

between which, in his view, can only be as an equal with an equal, and not just a subject with a subject.

The current digitalization poses new challenges not only to the traditional paradigms of life, but also to a man himself, who the dialogue must now refocus on a new coordinate system in the axis of educational and philosophical values and unusual communicative and cognitive models for. It can be assumed that these objective shifts became the basis of the dialogical theory of education of the Internet age and the prototype of dialogue with digits of Wegerif (2011). Studying the dialogics of cogitation and communication in the educational context, the British scholar insists on dialogue to be a way of existence, not only a way of cognition, and to form a peculiar 'dialogical space' of constantly generated senses. Slobodianiuk (2019) rightly indicates that Wegerif (2011) presents education as exploration, concentration and expansion of this dialogical space with certain people as well as with 'infinite The Other' (Slobodianiuk, 2019, p. 148). Considering the ideas of Wegerif, (2011), three types of dialogue should be mentioned: disputing (with its characteristic lack of evidence and unreasonable critic of opposed views), cumulative (new knowledge are based on the accumulation of expressed ideas beyond the critical reasoning) and exploratory (it entails argumentativeness and constructability with critical assessments of different variants, which assist in reaching a consensus as a result). It is absolutely predictable that the scholar stands for the exploratory dialogue to be appropriate as exchange of ideas of the educational communicators for creating some new knowledge.

A few words should be said about the conceptual idea of Canadian researchers Bereiter and Scardamalia which consists in interactive dialogical learning by 'building knowledge' (Bereiter, Scardamalia, 2014, p. 40). The last definition in the theory of the researchers is essential and assumes that dialogue is realized in a collective search for answers to questions by involving the individual subjective experience of each participant. For this purpose, some special virtual platforms are created, where new knowledge is produced through the free exchange of ideas and opinions, so the emphasis is shifted from the learning process to the building, i.e. generation of new knowledge, giving everyone involved in this process (teachers and students) an opportunity to learn during all their life. It is primarily about intentional learning – an active cognitive search, the purpose of which is learning itself. As aptly noted by Gvaldin (2017), Bereiter and Scardamalia (2014), 'the basis for the rise of 'pedagogy of knowledge building' was laid by their theoretic-

cal studies and created innovative educational programs of common learning' (Gvaldin, 2017).

Undoubtedly, the approach of Canadian specialists meets the modern demands and challenges of a digital permanently globalized world, however, in our deep conviction, the general focus on cyberspace excludes one crucial component of the dialogue – live communication with its unique palette of nonverbal communicative components that create a more expressive emotional background in interpersonal interactions.

It should be mentioned that despite the general integration of the postmodern dialogue of the education philosophy and pedagogics and its focus on the cyberspace and digital interactions, the problem of dialogics in offline is still relevant and vexed. It is probable that one can explain the popularity of the methodology of Professor Lipman (1991) thereby – the American program 'Philosophy for Children' is based on it. The researcher reaches back to the origins of dialogics – Socratic dialogues, modifying the general principle 'question-answer' according to the present demands. In the conceptual idea of Professor Lipman (1991), The Socratic question is matched with a stimulus philosophical-worldview text, whereas the answer, as for Socrates, entails the activation of cognition due to the creation of a problematic situation. Thus, analytical and critical thinking, individual experience and subjective thoughts of a person, creative approach and unconventional solutions are engaged. Analysing the didactic principles of the conceptual idea of Lipman (1991), Tylik (2020) presumes that it is referred to 'a peculiar format of relationship of a student and a teacher that entails their principal equality. In terms of the information paradigm of education, a teacher serves as a source of unique knowledge. A teacher's language is monologue aimed at a passive recipient of knowledge. <...> ... in terms of the problem-activity paradigm, the origins of which M. Lipman sees in dialectic, which was firstly suggested by Socrates, a teacher and a student enter into a dialogue purposed for moving jointly to the truth (Tylik, 2020, p. 58).

It should be noted that in one formulation or another, however, most experts, according to our observations, see the ultimate goal of dialogue in finding what will ultimately qualify as knowledge or truth. In this regard, some terminological 'blurring' of the definitions of 'knowledge', 'truth', 'search', etc. in the concepts of the abovementioned experts is interesting, so it can be assumed that in the end it is referred to relevant or identical concepts, that everyone chooses their own verbal representatives for them.

Conclusions

Hence, summarising the conducted studies of dialogue in the educational and philosophical postmodern view, it should be firstly ascertained about the status of general global academic universal assigned to dialogue as a key concept of philosophy, pedagogics, education philosophy, linguistics, ethics, etc. From this perspective, it is rightly to state that the unanimity of opinions of the scientific community regarding the definition and its interpretation represents not so much differences in understanding its nature, as the specifications of individual areas of knowledge. At the same time, the fact that the origins of dialogics date back to the ancient times and since then continue to be the subject of active professional discussions, both theoretical and practical, remains indisputable. This tendency is most evident in the ‘Socratic dialogues’, which themselves significantly influenced the formation of contemporary philosophical thought, on the one hand, and on the other – form the basis of postmodern concepts of philosophy of education today. It is these influences that marked the work of ‘Ukrainian Socrates’, whose pursuance of truth through dialogues in the projection of the philosophical thought of the XXI century, in our opinion, need more attention now from the professional community, because G. Skovoroda's ideas accord with the needs of the postmodern reality.

It has been learned that dialogue began to form as an academic subject of research in the XIX century due to the intensive searches of humanitarians in studying the dichotomy ‘I’ and ‘You’ affording grounds to speak of dialogics as an initial quality of the human consciousness. It has concurrently been determined that the term ‘dialogue philosophy’ corresponds with the theses of L. Feuerbach and main field-specific works of M. Buber. Its further formation was impacted by the ideas of M. Bakhtin as a precursor of postmodernism, within which dialogue was developing further as an educational-philosophical category.

The substance of the term ‘dialogic pedagogics’ has been studied on an individual basis, which is cognitive interaction first of all. From these provisions, dialogue as a component of the progressive postmodernist worldview of an individual organically follows and shifts the emphasis towards the equality of participants. The studied dialogics of cogitation and communication in the educational context afforded grounds to deduce that dialogue is a way of formation of the ‘dialogic space’ – generation of new senses every time.

It has been accentuated that the general global transformations due to the globalisation and digitalisation processes pose a more belligerent challenge every time to the traditional paradigms of the educational-philosophical conceptual ideas. This tendency appeared before the theory of 'knowledge building' within the virtual space as a platform for interpersonal interactions and searches, which holistically represents the contemporary postmodernist dialogue.

Hence, this attempt to study dialogue in the philosophical-educational postmodern space is only an individual attempt to comprehend the outlined problematics, which is not intended to be acknowledged as comprehensive and requires its further studying.

Acknowledgement

We confirm that all authors, namely Halyna Zhukova, Olha Vashevich, Oksana Patlaichuk, Tetiana Shvets, Nataliia Torchynska, Iryna Maidaniuk have made an equal contribution to the research in the following areas: documentation, data collection, data processing, writing the text, other activities, related to the research.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (2002). *Collected edition in 7 volumes*. V. 1 – 2003, V. 2 – 2000, V. 4(I) – 2008, V. 4(II) – 2010, V. 5 – 1997, V. 6 – 2002. Moscow: Russian dictionaries.
https://platona.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/istorija_russkaja/bakhtin_sobranie_sochinenij_7_tom/15-1-0-1220
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (2014). Knowledge building and knowledge creation: One concept, two hills to climb. In S. C. Tan, H. J. So, J. Yeo (Eds.) *Knowledge creation in education* (pp. 35–52). Springer.
https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-287-047-6_3
- Bespalov, I. O. (2019). Sokrat – yogo filosofiia ta dialogichniy metod [Socrates – his philosophy and dialogic method]. *Reporter of Kharkiv National University named after V. N. Karazyn. Theory of Culture and Philosophy of Science*, 59, 34-40.
<https://doi.org/10.26565/2306-6687-2019-59-05>
- Buber, M. (1937). *I and Thou*. T. & T. Clark. <http://www.maximusveritas.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/iandthou.pdf>
- Burbules, N. C. (1996). Postmodern Doubt and Philosophy of Education. *Philosophy of Education*, 36.
- Feuerbach, L. (1841). *Das Wesen des Christentums*. O. Wigand.
<https://archive.org/details/daswesendeschris00feueuoft>

- Freire, P. (1987). *Pedagogia do Oprimido*. Paz e Terra.
http://www.letras.ufmg.br/espanhol/pdf/pedagogia_do_oprimido.pdf
- Górzna, S. (2014). Martin Buber father of the philosophy of dialogue. *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 10(5), 45–53.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/296929456_Martin_Buber_father_of_the_philosophy_of_dialogue
- Gvaldin, O. Y. (2017). *Ponimanie dialoga v sovremennoi zarubezhnoi pedagogike* [Understanding of dialogue in the contemporary world pedagogics].
https://www.academia.edu/35868569/%D0%9F%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%BC%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%B5_%D0%B4%D0%B8%D0%B0%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%B0_%D0%B2_%D1%81%D0%BE%D0%B2%D1%80%D0%B5%D0%BC%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%B9_%D0%B7%D0%B0%D1%80%D1%83%D0%B1%D0%B5%D0%B6%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%B9_%D0%BF%D0%B5%D0%B4%D0%B0%D0%B3%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B5.pdf
- Humboldt, W. (1828). *Uber den Dualis*. Berlin, 36.
<https://archive.org/details/ueberdendualis00humb/page/n35/mode/2up>
- Johnson, D. M. (2005). Xenophon at his most socratic (memorabilia 4. 2). *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 29, 39-3.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/294641493_Xenophon_at_his_most_socratic_memorabilia_4_2
- Karavaieva, S. V. (2020). Slovo i delo v “Memorabiliakh” Ksenofonta [A word and a deed in ‘The Memorabilia’ by Xenophon]. *Reporter of the Russian Christian Humanitarian Academy*, 2(2), 218-228.
<http://doi.org/10.25991/VRHGA.2020.21.2.019>
- Kazakov, O. (2012). F. M. Dostoyevsky i L. Feuerbach: ob odnom iz vozmozhnykh istochnikov dialogizma Dostoyevskogo [F. M. Dostoyevsky and L. Feuerbach: about one of the possible sources of dialogics of Dostoyevsky]. *Reporter of Tomsk State University*, 361, 13-16.
<http://journals.tsu.ru/uploads/import/874/files/361-013.pdf>
- Kokhan, W. O. (2018). Paulo Freire and ‘Philosophy for Children’: critical dialogue. *Society and Power*, 6(74), 55-67. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/paulo-freire-i-filosofiya-dlya-detey-kriticheskiy-dialog>
- Kovalchuk, M. (2017). Dialogizm Martina Bubera ta mistse “Inshogo” v niomu [Dialogics of Martin Buber and role of ‘The Other’ in it]. *Scientific Notes of the National University ‘Ostrog Academy’*, 20, 18-22.
<https://eprints.oa.edu.ua/6113/1/6.pdf>
- Kozlova, T. A. (2020). Vliianie tendentsyi postmoderna na razvitie filosofskoi antropologii i filosofii obrazovaniia [Influence of the postmodern tendencies on the development of philosophical anthropology and

- education philosophy]. *Philosophical Thought*, 4, 14-23.
<https://doi.org/10.25136/2409-8728.2020.4.32437>
- Krutii, Y. (2013). Dialog yak mizhosobystystnyi zviazok (na prykladi dialogiv Platona ta Abeliara) [Dialogue as interpersonal connection (as exemplified by dialogues of Plato and Abailard)]. *Problems of Humanities. Philosophy*, 31, 148-158. http://dspu.edu.ua/filos_gum/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/2013_14.pdf
- Lipman, M. (1991). *Thinking in Education*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1991-98899-000>
- Matusov, E., & Lemke, J. (2015). Values in dialogic pedagogy. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 3, E1-E20.
<https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2015.141>
- Nefedchenko, O. I. (2017). Sokrativska dialogichna yevrystyka ta ii rozvytok u zarubizhnii ta vitchyzniani osviti [Socratic dialogic heuristics and its development in the world and national education]. *Pedagogical Sciences: Theory, History, Innovation Technologies*, 132-145.
<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/231759082.pdf>
- Nerubasska A., & Maksymchuk B. (2020). The Demarkation of Creativity, Talent and Genius in Humans: a Systemic Aspect. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(2), 240-255. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.2/172>
- Nerubasska A., Palshkov K., & Maksymchuk B. (2020). A Systemic Philosophical Analysis of the Contemporary Society and the Human: New Potential. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(4), 275-292. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.4/235>
- Peterson, S. (2011). *Socrates and Philosophy in the Dialogues of Plato*. University of Minnesota. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921346>
- Pukhyr, V. M. (2018). Dialogi Sokrata v praktike prepodavaniia antichnoi filosofii v vuze [Dialogues of Socrates in the practice of teaching ancient philosophy at a higher educational institution]. *Reporter of Moscow State Linguistic University. Education and Pedagogical Sciences*, 5(813), 50-68.
<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/dialogi-sokrata-v-praktike-prepodavaniya-antichnoy-filosofii-v-vuze>
- Shashkova, L. O., & Zlochevska, M. V. (2011). *Dialogichnyi vymir humanitarnogo z'nannia* [Dialogical dimension of humanitarian knowledge]. Monography. Kyiv: Professional.
<http://www.philosophy.univ.kiev.ua/uploads/editor/Files/Vykladachi/Shashkova/%D0%A8%D0%B0%D1%88%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B0,%20%D0%97%D0%BB%D0%BE%D1%87%D0%B5%D0%B2%D1%81%D1%8C%D0%BA%D0%B0%20-%20%D0%94%D1%96%D0%B0%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B3%D1%96%D1%87%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%B9%20%D0%B2%D0%B8%D0%>

[BC%D1%96%D1%80%20%D0%B3%D1%83%D0%BC%D0%B0%D0%BD%D1%96%D1%82%D0%B0%D1%80%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%BE%20%D0%B7%D0%BD%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%BD%D1%8F.pdf](#)

Siryk, L. M. (2011). Sokrativskiy metod ta yogo modernizatsiia v yevrestychnii osviti SSHA [Socratic method and its modernisation in the heuristic education of the USA]. *Problems of Training of a Contemporary Teacher*, 3, 68-75.
<https://res.in.ua/sokrativsekij-metod-ta-jogo-modernizaciya-v-evristichnij-osvit.html>

Skovoroda, G. (1973). *Povne zibrannya tvoriv u dvoekh tomakh* [Full Completed Edition: in 2 Vols]. Kyiv, V. 1. <http://izbornyk.org.ua/skovoroda/skov.htm>

Slobodianiuk, O. (2019). Dialogizatsiia osviti seredovyscha: vytoky i perspektyvy [Dialogisation of the educational space: beginnings and promises]. *Psychology*, 43, 142-150.
<http://dspace.tnpu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/17542>

Troitska, O. (2017). *Pryntsypy dialogu i tolerantnosti v rozgortanni suchasnogo kulturno-osvitniogo prostoru* [Principles of dialogue and tolerance in the unfolding of a contemporary cultural-educational space] [Dissertation Thesis, National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine, Higher Education Institute, Kyiv]. Ihed.org.ua. https://ihed.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Troitskaya_31.05.2017_diser.pdf

Tylik, A. V. (2020). Didakticheskie printsypy programy “Filosofiya dlya detei” (M. Lypman) v svete kontseptsyi universalnykh kompetentnosti [Didactic principles of the program ‘Philosophy for Children’ (M. Lypman) through the lens of the conceptual idea of universal competences]. *Pedagogics. Problems of Theory and Practice*, 5(1), 55-59.
<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/didakticheskie-printsipy-programmy-filosofiya-dlya-detey-m-lipman-v-svete-kontseptsii-universalnyh-kompetentnostey>

Volkov, A. (2015). Bakhtin kak predtecha postmodernizma [*Bakhtin kak predtecha postmodernizma*] [Video lecture]. N. K. Krupskaya Library. Koroliov.
<https://akatv.livejournal.com/9384.html?rfrom=mvenmass>

Wegerif, R. (2011). Towards a dialogic theory of how children learn to think. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 6(3). 179–190.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1871187111000435>

Xenophon. (1994). *Memorabilia*. Cornell University Press.
<https://philocyclevl.files.wordpress.com/2016/09/xenophon-memorabilia-or-the-recollections-cornell.pdf>

Yachmeniova, M. M. (2005). Do sutnosti termina “postmodernistskyi roman” [To the substance of the term ‘postmodern novel’]. *Reporter of Zhytomyr State*

University named I. Franko, 22, 207-211.

<http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/1389/1/05yammpr.pdf>

Zelenkina, S. V. (2013). Dialog s drugim v postmodernistskoi modeli chelovecheskogo bytiya [Dialogue with The Other in the postmodern model of human beingness]. *Reporter of Povolzhie Institute of Managemen*, 4(37), 93-97. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/dialog-s-drugim-v-postmodernistskoy-modeli-chelovecheskogo-bytiya>