



UDC 37.01:811

DOI 10.35433/pedagogy.4(111).2022.76-85

TRANSMISSION OF CULTURE AS A GOAL OF MODERN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

O. Ye. Misechko*

The article deals with one of the modern global trends – the transition from a monocultural to a multicultural perspective in social interaction. It focuses on the reflection of this trend in language education (both in native and foreign language). The problem is to reintegrate the cultural dimension into learning languages. The author of the article argues that the purpose of intercultural language education lies in the construction of an intercultural awareness as the ability of language users to act as representatives of certain cultures, be ready to accept the "otherness" of each other, respect the right to cultural difference, exhibit tolerant attitude to other's values and behaviour patterns, counteract stereotypes and bias, and to rethink their own cultural luggage. The study of a language is considered as an intercultural language education. The result of the intercultural approach in language education is viewed as the multicomponent intercultural competence – the unity of knowledge of one's own and other cultures; skills of discovery, interaction, and interpreting; curious and open attitude to one's own and another culture and country; critical cultural awareness. Dialogue of cultures is positioned as one of the key principles of intercultural foreign language education. It means readiness to listen to and understand multiple perspectives, products, practices, and cultural norms in one's own and other countries, even those with which you disagree, to have critical attitude towards stereotypes and prejudice, to be open for exchange of ideas based on mutual understanding and respect for cultural diversity. The modern language textbooks should be multicultural in their content, and contain information about not only the target language culture, but also offer materials on other cultures for visual and mental perception, discussion and comparison.

Key words: culture; intercultural communication; language education; intercultural dialogue; intercultural competence.

ТРАНСЛЯЦІЯ КУЛЬТУРИ ЯК МЕТА СУЧАСНОЇ МОВНОЇ ОСВІТИ

О. Є. Місечко

У статті розглядається одна із сучасних світових тенденцій – перехід від монокультурного до мультикультурного бачення соціальної взаємодії. Основна увага приділяється відображенню цієї тенденції у мовній освіті (у навчанні як рідної, так і іноземної мови). Проблема полягає в тому, щоб інтегрувати культурний вимір у вивчення мов. Автор статті дотримується думки, що мета міжкультурної мовної освіти має

* Doctor of Sciences (Pedagogy), Professor
(Ivan Franko National University of Lviv)
olha.misechko@lnu.edu.ua
ORCID: 0000-0002-6425-1322

полягати в побудові міжкультурної свідомості як здатності користувачів мови діяти як представники певних культур, бути готовими сприймати "інакшість" один одного, поважати право кожного на культурні відмінності, проявляти толерантне ставлення до цінностей і моделей поведінки інших, протидіяти стереотипам і упередженням, а також переосмислювати власний культурний багаж. Вивчення мови розглядається як міжкультурна мовна освіта. Результатом міжкультурного підходу в мовній освіті є багатокомпонентна міжкультурна компетентність – єдність знань про власну та інші культури; уміння досліджувати, виявляти й інтерпретувати культурологічну інформацію; здатність бути допитливим і відкритим у ставленні до своєї та чужої культури та країни; володіти критичним мисленням. Діалог культур позиціонується як один із ключових принципів міжкультурної іншомовної освіти. Це означає готовність слухати та розуміти різноманітні точки зору, практики та культурні норми у своїй та інших країнах, навіть ті, з якими ви не згодні, критично ставитися до стереотипів та упереджень, бути відкритим для обміну ідеями на основі взаєморозуміння та поваги до культурного різноманіття. Сучасні підручники з мов мають бути мультикультурними за своїм змістом і містити інформацію не лише про культуру мови, що вивчається, а й пропонувати матеріали про інші культури для візуального та розумового сприйняття, обговорення та порівняння.

Ключові слова: культура; міжкультурна комунікація; мовна освіта; міжкультурний діалог; міжкультурна компетентність.

Introduction of the issue. One of the global trends in the modern world is the transition from a monocultural to a multicultural perspective in the understanding of social interaction. This means that both socially and personally, the level of comfort in communication among people depends on the ability to react positively to the cultural diversity of the surrounding world, to recognize the right of people to cultural differences and to respect these differences. Such a transition has both positive and negative consequences. In the conditions of growing communication opportunities and geographic mobility, the number of contacts with representatives of other cultures increases significantly, which, on the one hand, expands and enriches our life experience, but on the other hand, it can infringe established views, provoke misunderstandings, tensions and conflicts. That is why UNESCO recognizes social cohesion as a key problem of political life in the 21st century [17], and dialogue between civilizations and cultures becomes a key component of its mission and activity [15].

Dialogue between cultures is being increasingly declared as "an instrument to govern the newly emerging cultural diversity" [12: 4]. At the same time, as N. Ratzman concludes from the analysis of the documents of influential

international organizations, the contemporary concept of intercultural dialogue differs significantly from the previous approaches of multiculturalism and assimilation in creating an inclusive society. In contrast to previous attempts to "focus on what cultures have in common instead of stressing the right to difference" and integrate "multiple and overlapping identities an individual can have" into common collective identity, intercultural dialogue recognizes the right to the existence of differences and encourages the coexistence of different cultural identities, mutual trust and mutual understanding [12]. Intercultural dialogue among nations "raises cultural diversity to the level of "the common heritage of humanity" [16]. Thus, the issue of polarization of the cultural environment around the so-called "cultural majority" or "cultural minorities" is removed.

In the modern interpretation of the concept of intercultural dialogue, it is important to have a broad understanding of the category "culture" in its tangible and intangible manifestations – as "the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, ... [that] encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs" [16]. Accordingly, dialogue as an

act of communication takes place at the level of both linguistic signs and non-verbal means. It transmits both facts, opinions, arguments and cultural knowledge, ideas, traditions, symbols, cultural norms, behaviour patterns, values, etc.

Therefore, more and more attention today is paid to cultural peculiarities affecting the nature of communication. This tendency has become increasingly significant part of modern language education aimed at teaching how to communicate.

Current state of the issue. As is known, consideration of communication through the prism of culture ("communication across cultures") began thanks to the scientific cooperation of American anthropologist Edward Hall and linguist George Trager in their work "The Analysis of Culture" (1953). E. Hall's popular science book "The Silent Language" (1959) became fundamental for the establishment of intercultural communication as a scientific field and the appearance of the very term "intercultural communication". However, some researchers (Rogers, 1994) consider him the "accidental founder" of the science of intercultural communication, since despite the conceptualization of the key term, its author did not contribute to the institutionalization of a new scientific field as a separate direction in the American academic sphere. He did not create a scientific school but continued his research in the area of non-verbal communication, in particular proxemia [13]. Nevertheless, scientific literature and practical guides on the topic of intercultural communication actively appeared in the USA in the second half of the 1960s and during the 1970s. In 1970, the International Communication Association (ICA, founded in 1950 in the USA) opened a department of intercultural communication.

The next wave of actualization of this problematic field in the Western science of communication dates back to the end of the XX - beginning of the XXI century and enjoys much wider geography

beyond the US. In Europe, intercultural communication has become a subject of discussion in the context of policies to improve the quality of communication between Europeans with different language and cultural backgrounds. A number of theories have been proposed: the cultural dimensions theory (Hofstede, 1984, 2001), the theory of cultural identity (Hall, 1990, 1992; Collier, 1998), the cultural accommodation theory (Giles, 1971, 1991), the cultural schema theory (Nishida, 1999), the theory of cross-cultural adaptation (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003), the model of intercultural competence (Byram, 1997), etc.

In the times of the former Soviet Union, research into the relationship between language and culture in the context of international communication started in the 1970s by works of linguists and methodologists Vereshchagin and Kostomarov (1971, 1973) on the material of teaching Russian as a foreign language. They introduced the term "lingvostranovedenie" and developed a linguistic theory of the word based on the relations between linguistic units and the culture of the target language. The same authors wrote the first definition of intercultural communication in Soviet scientific discourse, published in the fourth edition of their famous book "Language and Culture. Linguistic studies in the teaching of the Russian language as a foreign language" (1990). Following them, other researchers united linguistic and cultural studies into one complex philological discipline that studies a set of cultural values selected and organized in a certain way; investigates the communicative processes of the generation and perception of speech; analyses the experience of a linguistic personality and national mentality; gives a systematic description of the linguistic picture of the world, and ensures the fulfillment of educational learning tasks.

It is worth mentioning the theory of culture-corresponding language education and the appropriate model of professional teacher training developed in the 1990s by Passov. Instead of the

term "foreign language learning" he insisted on the term "foreign language education" as conceptually more ample and determined by personal needs of the learner. A foreign language teacher was positioned as a carrier and transmitter of the foreign culture [11]. The significance of the theory and model is determined by the practical approach to turn purely theoretical discussion about the importance of the connection between culture and language into the search for practical means of implementing culture-centric foreign language education.

In Ukraine, the concept of intercultural communication gained popularity in the early 2000s, together with the formulation of European integration aspirations and the popularization of the recommendations of the Council of Europe on language education. Initially, this topic was developed in the socio-philosophical discourse based on the study of the main trends of the interaction of Ukrainian and American cultures (Bushkova 2001), the problem of intercultural misunderstandings and intercultural translation (Maltseva 2002), sociological aspects of intercultural communication in Ukrainian higher educational institutions (Ivanova 2002), the philosophical category of language space in the international relations (Balashenko 2004), socio-philosophical analysis of language strategies for the formation of intercultural dialogue in the European space (Skubashevska 2005), a study of the socio-methodological aspect of multiculturalism as a socio-cultural model (Kulikova 2006), a socio-philosophical analysis of intercultural communication as a social phenomenon (Myazova 2008). Later, separate philological and culture-study dissertations appeared on issues of language/culture interaction in the conditions of bilingualism or intercultural communication (Donets 2004; Zakharova 2005; Malakhova 2007; Abrashkevichus, Kolosok 2009; Zaza 2010). In the pedagogical context, the formation of intercultural interaction skills has become a study subject in

connection with the conditions of staying in a polyethnic/multicultural environment (Vorotniak, Peretyaga 2008; Yaksa 2009) or the importance of intercultural competence for academic and professional goals (Kolbina 2010; Bakhov, Poroh 2011; Kostiuk 2018; Dyrda 2019; Gorlach 2020; Hnatenko 2021; Pryshliak 2021 et al.). With regard to the school educational process, the topic of intercultural communication has been developing since the end of the 1990s in terms of the competence-based approach in language teaching, in particular at the level of the formation of sociocultural and sociolinguistic competences as components of intercultural communicative competence. A systematized presentation of the basics of integrated teaching of foreign languages and cultures as a normative methodological approach was carried out in Ukraine only at the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century [3; 10].

Outline of unresolved issues brought up in the article. However, as evidenced by the theory and practice of teaching/learning languages, the modern image of language education as a transmitter of culture needs some modernization.

Aim of the research is to single out some problems that arise in the way of building an intercultural paradigm of modern language education.

Research methods. To achieve the aim, the study uses a set of research methods, such as: method of theoretical analysis of social, philosophical, and pedagogical ideas; method of structural and functional analysis of the key concepts (culture, intercultural communication, intercultural dialogue); methods of synthesis, induction, and deduction – to investigate correlation of language and culture; qualitative analysis, alternative analysis, and comparative analysis – to prove the importance of teaching languages in tight connection with culture.

Results and discussion. Among the initial ones, there is a problem of modern understanding of the concept of

intercultural communication (ICC). The development of this concept is very well traced by comparing its definitions in different scientific traditions. Thus, for the linguistic and cultural scientific tradition, which began to take shape in the writings of Vereshchagin and Kostomarov, their definition of ICC is typical as "adequate mutual understanding of a communicative act by its participants who belong to different national cultures" (1990) [18: 26]. According to these scholars, language does not exist apart from culture as a socially inherited entity of practical skills and ideas that characterize the way people live. They also emphasized the situation of overcoming obstacles related to the linguistic and cultural peculiarities of each of the communicators, which could cause misunderstandings between them. To identify the causes of such communicative conflict situations, Vereshchagin and Kostomarov used the concepts of "lexical background" and "background incompleteness/equivalence" that highlight the existence of special national-cultural semantics, conceptual associations inherent in a certain cultural community.

In general, the review of the related sources suggests that characteristic of the soviet/russian scientific tradition is the interpretation of the ICC mainly from linguistic ethnocentric positions; the emphasis is made on the verbal form of communication: the identification of linguistic signs with signs of national culture and national mentality; description of communication through the decoding of cultural information embedded in language; recognition of the determining influence of the "language picture of the world" on the formation of the individual's relations with the world, the norms and stereotypes of human behavior, the development of the "secondary linguistic personality".

Instead, in the Western scientific tradition, the semantic content of the ICC is significantly expanded in the socio-cultural direction, and

supplemented by the concept of intercultural dialogue. It is generalized and recorded in certain universally recognized documents of UNESCO and the Council of Europe. UNESCO interprets intercultural communication through intercultural dialogue by affirming the equal dignity of all cultures, the importance of mutual understanding and mutual respect as an essential prerequisite for building social unity. This organization assumes that "dialogue, as a holistic process based on openness towards others, is vital to overcome ignorance – ignorance of each other's way of life, values, language, history and heritage; ignorance which [...] is at the route of prejudices and wars" [14: 2]. To implement such an approach, "cultural pluralism" is encouraged at the local, regional and national levels. In its documents, the Council of Europe defines intercultural dialogue as "an open and respectful exchange of ideas between individuals and groups belonging to different cultures, which leads to a deeper understanding of the global perception of the other" [5]. In the continuation of this definition, in the following documents, an open and mutually respectful exchange of views, based on the equal value of partners, tolerance, the formation of a sense of unity and belonging, the prevention of prejudice, cultural stereotypes and conflicts comes to the fore [6].

The above-mentioned institutional conceptual approaches generally coincide with the interpretation of the concept of intercultural dialogue in the Western and Ukrainian scientific discourse. Some authors (Skubashevska 2004; Thomas 2008; Yevtukh 2009; Anderson 2010; Triandafyllidou 2011; Buchkovska 2013) focus primarily on the interactive character of dialogue between individuals or cultural groups with different cultural backgrounds and life views, with the aim of better mutual understanding, resolution of tensions or conflicts, mutual enrichment through attempts to reach a common idea even in conditions of different worldviews. Leeds-

Hurwitz (2014) is of the opinion, with which the author of this publication agrees, that in a dialogue between representatives of different cultural groups with different, sometimes contradictory, views, it is important to recognize the right of another one to be different, to demonstrate readiness and agreement to listen to each other's positions and to be heard, to accept existing differences with openness, tolerance, mutual respect [8]. A similar position is taken by Ratzmann (Ratzmann 2019), insisting that intercultural dialogue should go beyond the recognition and understanding of differences and should be based on the active cooperation of its participants for a common goal, the construction of common knowledge and experience.

In the first in Ukraine, as well as on the territory of the former USSR, "Dictionary of terms on intercultural communication", the definition of ICC is formulated also in the sociocultural dimension as "the process of communication (verbal and non-verbal) of people (groups of people) who belong to different national linguistic and cultural communities and, as a rule, they use different identical languages, feel the linguistic and cultural "foreignness" of the communication partner, have different communicative competence, which can cause communicative failures or cultural shock in communication" [1: 9]. Another Ukrainian scholar Manakin (2012), when shaping the subject of study in the field of the ICC, considers linguistic stereotypes and norms of behavior, communication, certain "cultural scenarios" of various actions, established models of perception and evaluation of objects and phenomena, socially standardized habits, traditions, rituals, permissions, prohibitions, etc., adopted in national communities, that is, various social manifestations of communication [9].

From the perspective of language education as a transmitter of culture, an expanded understanding of ICC seems more relevant, as it focuses the attention

of language teachers and learners not only on mastering the system of meanings imprinted in the lexical-grammatical composition of a certain language, since the language barrier is not the only obstacle to mutual understanding. No less valuable for the adequate implementation of communicative needs is acquaintance with the national consciousness, spiritual values, worldviews, behavioral models, socio-cultural background of people who use this language. Accordingly, learning a language ceases to be a purely technological educational process, but receives a broader educational mission of preparing the language user to the role of a conveyor of culture, that is, it transforms into language education.

It is impossible not to agree with those scientists who are alarmed by the growing distance between education and culture, between knowledge and spiritual and social values. They recognize an important humanistic potential in the return of education to the function of cultural transmitter. Based on the results of an educational study on the cultural and intercultural aspects of language learning, that was conducted in 2011 at the request of the Council of Europe, Beacco notes that in connection with the growing number of intercultural contacts – real and virtual – there is a need to re-integrate the cultural dimension into the classroom context. He also points out that limiting the study of languages to purely functional needs of mastering language as a means of communication and operating stereotyped facts about the target language-native countries turns this process into a concise generalization and narrows the possibilities of delving into the true cultural diversity. In this way, teachers may "play down the importance of such goals as "communicating to learn" or "communicating in order to understand (the world)" [2]. In this context, the strengthening of culture-centricity in the content and process of language education and an adequate professional training of language

teachers is becoming an actual scientific and practical problem today.

At the same time, reducing the meaning of the term "dialogue of cultures" to "comparison of cultures" is a simplification of the concept. Rather, it is more important that communicators achieve common meanings in the process of communication despite their individual cultural differences. The apparent simplicity of the term "dialogue of cultures" hides the temptation to interpret it mainly as a comparison of certain cultural manifestations, cultural background and cultural norms in different countries. However, in the official UNESCO documents on intercultural competence, we find that intercultural dialogue comprises "an open and respectful exchange of views between individuals and groups with different ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic backgrounds and heritage, on the basis of mutual understanding and respect"; it assumes that its "participants agree to listen to and understand multiple perspectives, including even those held by groups or individuals with whom they disagree"; it "encourages readiness to question well-established value-based certainties by bringing reason, emotion and creativity into play in order to find new shared understandings" [7: 14]. Thus, behind the word "dialogue" stands not only the right to express oneself, but also the right to be heard and accepted, the opportunity to feel like an equal participant in communication and the obligation to cooperate in reaching an understanding.

The organization of language education in the spirit of cultural dialogue is one of the key principles of the formation of intercultural communicative competence. In the most cited model of intercultural communicative competence by Byram [4], comparison of the "cultural pictures" of one's own and other countries provides a critical understanding of oneself and another person, encourages a little distance from the usual perception of one's cultural identity and

gives a look at oneself through the eyes of the interlocutor – a representative of another culture. This model includes:

- knowledge about social groups in one's own and other cultures, products and practices of their social activities, as well as about general processes of social and individual interaction (e.g. historical and modern relations between one's own and other country; "national memory" of one's country and the attitude to these events from the point of view of citizens of one's country and other countries; national definitions of the geographical space of one's country and their perception by other countries; social institutions affecting daily life; interaction processes in one's country);

- skills of interpreting events or documents in another country, explaining them and comparing them with events and documents in one's own country, identifying their ethnocentric aspect;

- skills of discovery and interaction; ability to acquire new knowledge about culture, cultural meanings and connotations, similarities and differences in verbal and non-verbal communication; ability to operate this knowledge under appropriate circumstances;

- curious and open attitude to one's own and other cultures, interest in discovering new points of view on familiar and unfamiliar phenomena in one's own and other cultures, readiness to question the values and assumptions in the cultural practice of one's environment;

- critical cultural awareness as the ability to critically evaluate, on the basis of clear criteria, cultural perspectives, products and practices of one's own and other cultures.

Despite the critical remarks that are made about the lack of references in this model to other competencies (linguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic, etc.), it is recognized by many Western researchers as the most complete and clearly formulated. In addition, in the combination of intercultural and intracultural analysis emphasized in this model, a fundamental difference can be

seen. This is the difference between a two-way intercultural dialogue between "one's own" and "another" culture and the one-sided sociocultural competence of the speaker in relation to "another" country, under which the domestic foreign language education understands "the totality of knowledge about the country whose language is studied, the national and cultural features of the social and speech behavior of native speakers" [10: 6]. More recent view of the modern training of foreign language teachers in Ukraine draws much more attention to the importance of intercultural reflection on both one's own and another culture [3: 33-37].

One more distinguished feature of the intercultural dialogue that is apparent in this model is its cognitive nature. It involves processes of acquiring knowledge, revealing common meanings, explaining assumptions, integrating many points of view, eliminating judgments, showing curiosity, reflection, achieving understanding and formulating one's own point of view. It stimulates the participants to be collecting and processing information, attentive and logical, inquisitive and open towards new findings, curious and critical, interpreting and evaluating.

In the context of language education, intercultural dialogue is perceived both as a goal and as a tool. As a goal, it combines a powerful practical linguistic and educational (mastery of the language system as a means of communication), general educational (knowledge of one's own and other countries and cultures), moral (formation of general civilizational values, beliefs, attitudes), developmental (mastery of various communication strategies, formation of a new culture-centric consciousness) potential. As a tool, it can regulate the content and organization of language education, that is, stimulate the use of texts relevant for intercultural contact, which demonstrate real-life speech and mechanisms of intercultural communication, reflect the problems of intercultural communication.

In this connection, the question of designing foreign language textbooks

that would correspond to the intercultural paradigm of language education arises. The author of this article argues that the culture-forming potential of textbooks will be higher when they contain information about the culture of not only the countries whose language is being studied, but also introduce other cultures of the world. With unshaken dedication to the Soviet-era trend, the authors of modern domestic foreign language textbooks offer the learners texts mainly about various fields of culture and social life in the target language countries. They give the acting characters of the textbooks the traits and behaviour patterns typical exclusively of the native inhabitants of these countries; suggest communicative situations mainly with native speakers of the country of the language studied, encourage drawing cross-cultural parallels with the target language culture. However, the surrounding world has long ceased to be culturally homogeneous; it is developing in the direction of increasing migration processes, academic and professional mobility of citizens of this "global village". In addition, English, German, French, and Spanish, which are studied in most educational institutions of Ukraine, have the generally recognized status of languages of international communication and belong to the official languages of the UN (except German). Therefore, the situation when the learners can use the language in communication either with a non-native speaker or in a non-native country becomes more typical in the real life of the users of the above-mentioned foreign languages. Therefore, it seems that a modern foreign language textbook should be multicultural in its content and contain information not only about the culture of the country whose language is being studied, but also offer its readers cultural materials about different countries and cultures for visual and mental perception, discussion and comparison.

Conclusions and research perspectives. Understanding the

essence of intercultural communication and the modern vision of intercultural dialogue is fundamentally important in teaching native and foreign languages, as the intercultural approach is currently leading in language teaching in Ukraine, as well as in the entire civilized world.

The apprehension of modern language education as a transmitter of culture implies the recognition of intercultural communication not only as a communicative act that takes place between representatives of different cultures, but as external (verbal and non-verbal) and internal connections between people with different cultures, national, social, linguistic, cultural identities, skills of interpretation, analysis and critical understanding of both native and foreign culture.

Teaching languages in such a context should develop intercultural awareness of language users as the ability to see in themselves and their interlocutor carriers of certain cultures. They should be ready to understand a different way of life and thinking, to accept "otherness", to respect the right to cultural difference, be tolerant of values and behavioral models in another culture, counteract stereotypes and prejudices, rethink one's own cultural baggage, resolve cultural misunderstandings in a civilized way, reach consensus in a situation of cultural conflict, etc. The fundamental goals of intercultural language education should be aimed at achieving a developed and sustainable coexistence in multicultural societies by building mutual understanding, respect and dialogue between different cultural groups. Knowledge about one's own and foreign culture should become integral components of intercultural language education, together with communicative,

cognitive, interpretive skills; inquisitive and open attitude to the culture of "own" and "other" country; critical intracultural and intercultural consciousness.

One of the key principles of intercultural language education should be the principle of the dialogue of cultures, which means, when comparing cultural manifestations, cultural background and cultural norms in different countries, the willingness, to respectfully accept different points of view, even those with which it is difficult to agree, to be critical of established statements, to practice an open exchange of ideas based on mutual understanding and respect for cultural diversity. Means of intercultural foreign language education (in particular, textbooks) should also be adequate.

The need to use broadly the concept of "intercultural dialogue" is obvious and urgent for domestic language education, since both within the boundaries of a multinational country, which is Ukraine, and in the perspective of full integration into the pan-European community, the readiness of our citizens for civilized intercultural communication will be among the determining factors for the success. The field of language education (in both native and foreign languages), like no other educational field, should be concerned with the problem of formation and development of sufficient cultural awareness, appropriate knowledge, skills, and attitudes, foster respect for one's own culture and the cultures of other peoples, develop ability to understand and learn from speakers of other cultural practices.

Further development of the raised problem is seen in the solution of these issues.

REFERENCES (TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Batsevych, F.S. (2007). *Slovník terminiv mizhkul'turnoyi komunikatsiyi [Dictionary of terms of intercultural communication]*. Kyiv: Dovira [in Ukrainian].
2. Beacco, J.-C. (2011). *The cultural and intercultural dimensions of language teaching: current practice and prospects*. Text presented at the Seminar on "Curriculum convergences for plurilingual and intercultural education", Strasbourg, 29-30 November 2011. Retrieved from: <https://studylib.net/doc/7564325/the-cultural-and-intercultural->

dimensions-of-language-tea... [in English].

3. Bihych, O.B., Borysko, N.F., Borets'ka, H.E. & in./ za zah. red. S.Yu. Nikolayevoyi. (2013). *Metodyka navchannya inozemnykh mov i kul'tur: teoriya i praktyka: pidruchnyk dlya stud. klasychnykh, pedahohichnykh i linhvistychnykh universytetiv [Methods of teaching foreign languages and cultures: theory and practice: a textbook for students. classical, pedagogical and linguistic universities]*. Kyiv: Lenvit [in Ukrainian].

4. Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters [in English].

5. Council of Europe. (2008). *White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue. Living together as Equals in dignity. 118th Session of the Committees of Ministers*. Strasbourg, 7 May 2008 [in English].

6. Council of Europe. (2014). *The concept of intercultural dialogue*. Retrieved from: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/concept_EN.asp#P30_3374 [in English].

7. *Intercultural competences. Conceptual and operational framework*. (2013). Paris: UNESCO, 2013. Retrieved from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000219768> [in English].

8. Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (2014). *Intercultural Dialogue. Key concepts in intercultural dialogue*. Center for Intercultural Dialogue [in English].

9. Manakin, V.M. (2012). *Mova i mizhkul'turna komunikatsiya: navch. posib. [Language and intercultural communication: teaching. manual]*. Kyiv: Center "Akademiya". Seriya "Al'ma mater" [in Ukrainian].

10. Nikolayeva, S.Yu. (2010). Zmist navchannya inozemnykh mov i kul'tur u serednikh navchal'nykh zakladakh. [The content of teaching foreign languages and cultures in secondary educational institutions]. *Inozemni movy – Foreign languages*, № 3, 3-10 [in Ukrainian].

11. Passov, E.Y. (2002). Kul'turosoobraznaya model' professyonal'noy podhotovky uchytelya: fylosofyya, sodержanye, realizatsyya [A culture-appropriate model of professional teacher training: philosophy, content, implementation]. *Inozemni movy – Foreign languages*, № 4, 3-18 [in russian].

12. Ratzmann, Nora. (2019). *Intercultural dialogue. A review of conceptual and empirical issues relating to social transformation*. MOST Discussion Papers/01. UNESCO [in English].

13. Rogers Everett, M.A. (1994). *History of Communication Study: A Biographical Approach*. New York: Free Press [in English].

14. *The Dialogue among civilizations and cultures: UNESCO's strategic approaches and programmatic focus*. (2008). UNESCO. Retrieved from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000159171> [in English].

15. UNESCO. (2000). *Dialogue among Civilisations. Backgroun*. Retrieved from: <http://www.unesco.org/dialogue/en/background.htm> [in English].

16. UNESCO. (2002). *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity: a vision, a conceptual platform, a pool of ideas for implementation, a new paradigm*. Retrieved from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000127162> [in English].

17. UNESCO. (2009). *Investing in cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue*. Paris: UNESCO [in English].

18. Vereshchahyn, E.M., & Kostomarov, V.H. (1990). *Yazyk i kul'tura: linhvostranovedenie v prepodavanii russkoho yazyka kak inostrannoho. 4-uzd., pererab. dop. [Language and culture: Linguistic studies in the teaching of the russian language as a foreign language. 4th edition, revised. add]*. Moscow: rus. yaz. (Byblyoteka prepodavatelya russkoho yazyka kak ynostrannoho) [in russian].

Received: November 07, 2022

Accepted: December 09, 2022