

УДК 37.01

## DIALOGUE AS THE BASIS OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

**Losev Alexander Sergeevich**

master of pedagogy

Far Eastern Federal University, School teachers, Ussuriisk

**Loseva Anastasia Vladimirovna**

master of pedagogy

Primorskiy Institute of railway transport, Ussuriisk

*author@apriori-journal.ru*

**Abstract.** In the real work dialogue reconsideration attempt, as main form of interaction of the teacher and pupil is presented. Features of conducting dialogue during its formation and reveal today. Features of conducting the educational conversations allowing to influence qualitatively formation of the personality within modern pedagogical process reveal.

**Key words:** dialogue; formation of the personality; education.

---

## ДИАЛОГ, КАК ОСНОВА ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНОГО ПРОЦЕССА

**Лосев Александр Сергеевич**

магистр

Дальневосточный федеральный университет, Уссурийск

**Лосева Анастасия Владимировна**

магистр

Приморский Институт железнодорожного транспорта, Уссурийск

**Аннотация.** В настоящей работе представлена попытка переосмысления диалога, как основной формы взаимодействия учителя и ученика. Раскрываются особенности ведения диалога в период его становления и на сегодняшний день. Раскрываются особенности ведения воспитательных бесед позволяющих качественно влиять на формирование личности, в рамках современного педагогического процесса.

**Ключевые слова:** диалог; формирование личности; воспитание.

Transfer of experience, knowledge and abilities to younger generation, is the main objective of mankind which quality of performance influences its safety, prosperity and development. Despite all achievements of a civilization, for the last millennia, the main and most productive form of transfer of knowledge there is a dialogue. Dialogue as a method of training and education is one of the first and most productive methods in pedagogics, its importance was emphasized by many thinkers-philosophers (Socrates, Platon, Confucius, etc.) and great figures of pedagogics (Ya. Komensky, I. Gerbart, F. Dinter of A. Disterveg). The last created concept of a dialogical method of training and opened its versions which reached up to now and are actively used in educational process [1; 3].

Since ancient times many philosophers allocated for this form a priority as opportunities only to impart to younger generation the accumulated knowledge, but also to comprehend new, having taught the person to the main methods of knowledge and interaction with the world: to the analysis of the received information, its comparison with earlier known, to forming of analogies, abstraction from surrounding reality, to generalization received [3-5].

However the modern organization of dialogue and the purpose which are set before it, underwent very considerable changes. Thought that in modern pedagogical process dialogue carries out various pedagogical tasks which not always develop and bring up the personality in that sense which great teachers bequeathed, at present, has the right for existence. Perhaps, it is connected with that the purposes of pedagogical process too are corrected and change over time. The history shows that often those who stood at the origins of introduction of innovative methods to educational process, weren't always pleasing in due time to the state representatives since were pioneers and revolutionaries of the business which fruits in a consequence admitted great and significant.

From there is an assumption that true dialogue as a form of full and real all-round development of the personality, didn't reach in an original form up to

now. And those transformations which were brought in it as in a way of knowledge of the world, don't allow to involve it in modern educational process, fully.

In the real work dialogue reconsideration attempt, as main form of interaction of the teacher and pupil is presented. Features of conducting dialogue during its formation and reveal today. The dialogue role in education of the personality, its influence not on quality training, and on education and development of moral qualities of the personality is considered. Features of conducting the educational conversations allowing to influence qualitatively formation of the personality within modern pedagogical process reveal.

The first mentions of dialogue as about a method of education and training, treat Socrates's times. In them dialogue acts as the instrument of search of truth, allowing to reduce observed to the general concepts on the basis of which there is a judgment about subjects or the phenomena. Dialogue acted as some kind of instrument of creation of some space within which process of knowledge and search of truth was conducted. An indispensable condition was that it couldn't take place without communication and without presence of the second person, whether isn't dependent on that is he the opponent or the adherent. No wonder, what exactly it formed the basis of Sokrat school where already in those days the person was considered as a being highly moral, demanding the corresponding relation which in a consequence in pedagogics will be called humanistic. Organizing dialogues with pupils, Socrates called, not to impose the point of view, and using abilities to ask questions, to force the pupil to express own opinion and understanding of the discussed. Using dialogue as question-answer system of training, the teacher had to train pupils in logical thinking: to conduct dialogue, polemic, logically to think. Inducing the pupil to develop consistently a contentious clause, the teacher led it to awareness of absurdity, thereby turning his look on the correct way, forming the correct conscious result.

Socrates claimed that outside the real dialogue there is no original wisdom, and only imaginary wisdom and multiknowledge, more precisely, a «multyknowledge» is possible. A distinctive feature of the real dialogue, during its formation, acts that fact that each of interlocutors acts as equal, even in that case if one of participants of dialogue is a pupil. Great people (Platon, Aristotle), perhaps not always concordant with the teacher, but as well as it, able to learn truth and to create new knowledge [3] became result of true training.

In spite of the fact that thanks to the German teachers (to I. Gerbart, F. Dinter, A. Disterveg) during formation of pedagogics as sciences, any dialogue form of education was proclaimed a driving force, and the key to success in training and education, up to now it reached with essential changes. Changes qualitative and basic though conditions of the organization of dialogue formally remained former: humanity, mutual respect, ability to listen, hear and ask questions. Safety of the last can be referred to merits of those German teachers (to I. Gerbart, F. Dinter, A. Disterveg) which of the importance of dialogue in pedagogical process, tried to realize it in an original form.

In particular, A. Disterveg allocated two main methods of training one of which was a dialogue method called by interrogative training. Already then A. Disterveg emphasized universality of this form which can be used both for studying, and for check. Dividing the studied subjects on historical (history, geography, etc.) and rational (mathematics, physics, etc.) A. Disterveg suggested to develop training methods on dialogue, even for subjects of the historical plan. In the way of activization of thinking, when training in historical (humanitarian) subjects, A. Disterveg suggested to give to pupils the chance to act as the teacher [1]. The main merit of A. Disterveg became introduction of dialogue training in pedagogics as independent method, how many ability to allocate it in other methods of training, to systematize and develop a technique of their productive use isn't simple. According to A. Disterveg, «Where it is only possible, it is necessary to stick to dialogical form of education» [1].

This thought of A. Distervega, was traced long time as a basis of development and education of the person since if process of training in pedagogics is represented complete and comprehensive, education process, doesn't come to an end on a call of a lesson and has to be continuous and comprehensive. In it also there is its complexity and integrity. Education which the pupil in the course of dialogue with the teacher receives it not simply the arch of moral norms. Ancient compared education about development of soul, and training to development of a body (mind). At such approach to business, it isn't difficult to establish that process of education is much more difficult, than training. To teach the person it is possible to consider in a year and if to set the corresponding practical (vital) motivation and that quicker, and to teach him to see fine in blossoming of an Oriental cherry, sometimes there will be no all life also. No wonder that pupils, in the ancient time living near teachers, were constantly in their society, it is realized and it isn't realized adopted knowledge and visions of this world.

One of the main places to dialogue in education as development not only bodies, but also souls, «The teacher of teachers» of the Great nation – Confucius spoke. It isn't surprising that moral development of the Chinese people, even at the present stage, often surpasses the level of the European people. Heritage, bequeathed Confucius: subjects of his conversations with pupils, manuals to governors, aspirations to an ideal of «the noble husband», is heritage of any nation, and the whole world which not always wishes it to learn, and sometimes it is simply not ready.

It should be noted that Confucius always bore the doctrine to people, continuing to bear it and till today. At its school opened for all, without touching charitable and sublime nature of the training, the main basis of training, irrespective of the social status, the soul, its ability to follow canons, precepts, aspiration continued to bring up itself, to expel from itself insincerity and rage acted [2].

Dialogue at Confucius was the main form of the doctrine, doctrine, but not training, and it was explained by the following vision. «Information transfer

actually teaches nothing. The teacher initially, can't tell how it is necessary to live, but to act as a moral guideline in this world, he is able. And despite that existence of the index doesn't guarantee yet that the person will manage to reach the end, it is pledge of that the road is chosen correctly. The teacher transfers himself, the image, the spiritual shape. The pupil shouldn't takes away the main place of information, and to direct the efforts to reproduction in itself teachers. He as Chinese spoke, goes «to him in a trace», from here and a strange method of training of Confucius: it seems, he speaks about anything, all life carries out in conversations, but not in lecturing» [2].

Compelling the pupil to participate in common in work of the thought, the teacher caused in is mute empathy, reaching such level when in words if disappeared need. Reviewing various examples from antiquity and history about governors and wise men, Confucius focuses attention how the person in this or that situation behaved, by what moral qualities and thoughts he was guided, whether it's were virtuous or not. Denying scholastic training, Confucius came to the upset condition of spirit when pupils couldn't reflect over the told mentor [2]. As an indicator of understanding and consciousness for it ability of the pupil to ask a question or reasonably to object the teacher served, having expressed the opinion. Strangely enough, but in the modern world, this reaction, especially at school, is perceived by the teacher, as disrespect and impudence from the pupil. It is one of the main basic distinctions in approach to modern dialogue training.

Process of the doctrine according to Confucius is comprehension of knowledge, in difference, from modern pedagogical process on transfer of knowledge and formation of abilities, skills and competences. Knowledge a priori, it is impossible to transfer, it is possible to transfer the systematized information, but it not knowledge yet. This difference to approach of training led to that dialogue as a method of training was changed to please the new purposes, thereby having lost the validity and productivity.

Dialogue according to Confucius put the teacher and the pupil on one level, thereby lifting the last to an appropriate level of an enlightenment, without marking out distinction between them, the one who best of all studies itself appears the best mentor. ««To study and not to reflect – waste of time; to reflect and not to study – it is pernicious». It is always necessary to study and everywhere, without hesitating to study even at the passerby and the commoner. «Going to the companies of two people, I all the same will find to that to learn at them. I will try to adopt high qualities, and having learned about bad lines from others, I will try to correct the same at myself». But here question: that should study? The Teacher spoke: «I don't treat those who was born with knowledge. I love antiquity and thanks to it, having shown comprehension, got them». So, it is only one necessary to study – antiquities, is more exact to that order which existed once at ancestors to reproduce it in today's life» [2].

Modern training which provides the certain method realized within the concrete theory, verification of this theory by practice was unacceptable for Confucius. The person has to touch knowledge with the heart, recreate necessary images and make the representation. Desire to systematize already gained knowledge and natural laziness of mankind, I was the reason for creation of various pedagogical theories which realization in practice, forms such feeling that they are directed on what to stop development of humanity at a certain favorable stage, and it is simple to betray to each subsequent generation a set of information sufficient for quiet existence. Such consumer attitude towards knowledge resulted in laziness of soul that was the greatest manifestation of immorality in the ancient time. And as result, immorality internal it started being shown at all levels in bad manners, hypocrisy and arrogance.

What education, on own example, the modern teacher if he isn't able to answer the intelligent question of the pupil which is beyond a subject can show «a trace in a trace». Not the desire and not ability will prompt, only one answer: «it doesn't belong to the considered occupation subject». As a result

the teacher reserves the right to ask questions, imposing the logic thinking as a template of the correct thought process. Building system of questions and bringing the pupil to necessary result, the teacher considers that thereby will organize dialogue communication, forgetting that in true dialogue questions are asked by both participants. The pupil, having remained without own built critical thinking, turns only in a carrier of the received information. If addresses to comparison ancient, the person with a unique vessel of knowledge where contents defined the contents, the modern pupil we will present in the form banks with water and distinctions between different pupils only in volume, but not in the contents. Therefore as the personality, he is often not interesting, transparent, straightforward and it isn't always capable will satisfy thirst of the interlocutor.

Big defect in the circumstances and in of modern teacher. Possibly desire ness owing to ambitions, age, the status, own importance or not ability to condescend to the pupil for the organization of dialogue as equals, leads to that the pupil all the time is in a waiting mode or aspirations to reach the teacher's level. But even at the most diligent pupil the patience independently sometimes comes to an end going, being guided by an unattainable image and lack of reference points in way. Unlike the modern organization of pedagogical process, independence has to be in judgments and perception, as the basis for receiving new knowledge, i.e. on the way of self-knowledge, but not on the way of knowledge of the world where the pupil has to go with the teacher who at the right time will prompt that is immoral and not to the person to «the noble husband».

## СПИСОК ИСПОЛЬЗОВАННЫХ ИСТОЧНИКОВ

1. Masich V. Contribution of foreign teachers of XIX of century in development of dialogue development // The Gymnasium of primary education. Slavyansk, 2010. V. 53. P. 2. P. 188-193.
2. Popov P.S. Confucius. Judgments of conversation. Publishing house: Alphabet, Azbuka-Attikus, 2011. 224 p.
3. Rozhansky I.D. Fragments of early Greek philosophers. M.: Science, 1989. P. 1.
4. Sinitsyn E.S. Theory of creativity. Structural analysis of thinking. The theory of the integrated training. Novosibirsk: Publishing house of NGAHA, 2001. 448 p.
5. Slastenin V.A. Pedagogic process as system. M.: MAGISTR-PRESS publishing house, 2000. 488 p.