

## Theoretical Bases Of Developing Students' Intercultural Competence

Samanova Shahlo Bahtiyarovna

Teacher, Uzbek State World Languages University

**Abstract:** *theoretical development of a methodology for the formation of intercultural competence of students and the concept of a dialogue of cultures is now firmly established in world scientific thought; it has been adopted by international organizations as a fundamental one. The article deals with the issues based on analyzing the specifics of basic cultural concepts in the system of knowledge about culture.*

**Key words:** *culture, communication, cultural experience, traditions, nations, relationship of culture, globalization.*

Modern society has firmly entered the period of globalization. The result of the process of globalization has become a wide range of opportunities for communication of carriers of different cultures with each other. In the context of the interaction of cultures, virtually all international, interstate, and often intrastate institutions today function. As experience shows, in order to effectively support these diverse and multi-level contacts, it is no longer just sufficient knowledge of the appropriate language, but knowledge of norms, rules, traditions, customs, etc. is needed another culture.

The term culture itself is multidimensional, multifaceted, and multidimensional in it, there are many semantic meanings (up to 500 meanings): culture as norms of behavior, culture as a worldview, culture as human activity in its most diverse manifestations, including all forms and methods of human self-expression and self-knowledge, accumulation by man and society as a whole of skills and abilities, etc. The etymology of the syncretic, undivided and essentially

multidimensional concept of “culture” is rooted in the history of the ancient world and goes back to the Latin “cultura”, meaning cultivating, educating, educating, developing; but since Roman antiquity it has been used in a figurative sense - upbringing, enlightenment.

The importance of culture in the development and formation of man has become the object of research by many scientists, including V. Humboldt, L. S. Vygotsky, M. S. Kagan, K. Levi-Stros, A. M. Lobok, P. A. Florensky and other

The many definitions of the term “culture” are connected, among other things, with the fact that this concept is considered in the framework of different approaches, most often: anthropological, axiological, normative, activity, sign-symbolic, semiotic, structuralistic and epistemological. In addition to the aforementioned, A. Sadokhin and V. Boldyrev distinguish sociological, psychological, historical and didactic approaches as leaders:

- The sociological approach is based on an understanding of culture as a factor in the organization of social life, a set of ideas, principles, and social institutions.

- The psychological approach is based on the relationship of culture and psychology of human behavior.

- In the historical approach, emphasis is placed on the assertion that culture is a product of the history of society, and it develops through the transfer of human experience from generation to generation.

- The didactic approach considers culture as a set of qualities that a person receives in the process of education and training and which are not transmitted at the genetic level [22; 169].

According to N.Yu. Russova, two more approaches relevant for didactics should also be added:

- The hermeneutic approach - culture as a collection of texts and as a basis for the birth of these texts.

-Information - culture as a system for the creation, storage, transmission and use of information.

There are various concepts of the concept of culture. So, for example, E. Sepir speaks of three main meanings or groups of meanings of the concept of culture. Firstly, culture can be used as a technical term that encompasses any socially inherited traits of the human: life, material and spiritual. Secondly, culture can relate to some rather conditional ideal of individual “good manners”, which is based on an insignificant body of acquired knowledge and experience, sanctioned by the social class and a long tradition. Thirdly, culture is understood as civilization, taken to the extent that it embodies the national spirit. Therefore, the concept of culture “is aimed at encompassing in a single term those general attitudes, views on life and the specific manifestations of civilization that allow a particular people to determine their place in the world” [2, p. 69].

Having analyzed the spectrum of interpretations of these terms, Russian researchers came to the conclusion that there are two main types of communication between people: 1) information transfer; 2) joint coexistence of people. The first type is called “communication”, and the second - “communication”. Following M.S.Kagan, we distinguish “communication as a process of transferring information by a subject to a certain object (person, animal, computer) - and communication as a practical and spiritual interaction of subjects, that is, an activity during which each of its participants addresses to another as a subject, as an equal to himself, free and unique being ”[5, p. 117]. The distinction between communication and communication is especially important for the interaction of cultures. These positions are fundamental for intercultural dialogue, as involve the interaction of cultures.

Intercultural interaction should “understand the phenomenon of public life, in which representatives of various cultures come into contact, regarded as carriers of the norms of morality and law, worldview, knowledge in all kinds of areas of

human activity, traditions and customs; possessing a certain intellectual, moral, aesthetic level of development, emotional-volitional and value attitude to people around them, work, communication, etc .; owning methods and forms of activity, communication with the outside world. Note that the most important feature of intercultural interaction as a sociocultural phenomenon, in addition to a given practical function, is that it is aimed at mutual knowledge, enrichment of cultural and spiritual development by experience ”[2]. In the process of intercultural interaction, if it is based on a dialogical principle, there is a mutual understanding of representatives of different cultures, in which none of them lose their own cultural identity. As V. Boldyrev rightly points out, “a dialogue of cultures becomes possible only when we not only get acquainted with the fact of a foreign culture, ... but we accept it as one of the possible options” [2, p.135].

In modern Western philosophy, the dialogical direction is associated with the name of M. Buber. M. Buber considered the dialogue not a collision of two communicative flows, but a community arising in consciousness as a result of a meeting of "I" and "the other." It should be noted that at the same time, both a consensus and a desire to defend one's point of view in front of foreign cultural influence arise in the dialogue. Dialogue contributes to the movement of conflict into the intellectual sphere and is thereby a productive alternative to war. One of the key topics of M. Buber's philosophy is the problem of interpersonal communication. “In connection with this there is a need,” writes T. Lifintseva, to define one of the most important concepts of his philosophy (as well as many currents of “post-classical” philosophy) - the concept of “Other”. The other is that which I am not, different in relation to me, and at the same time similar to me, an equal subject to me, possessing personality traits ”[76].

M.M. Bakhtin understands culture as a form of communication between people of different cultures, a form of dialogue. For him, “culture is where there are two (at least) cultures, and that the self-awareness of culture is a form of its

being on the verge of a different culture” [6, p. 85]. He was sure that each holistic culture was characterized by “ambivalence”, in the sense of a simultaneous appeal to other cultures and internal reflection. M. Bakhtin believed that “contact with any cultural object becomes questioning and conversation, that is, dialogue”. Dialogue, from the point of view of Bakhtin, is a way of interaction of consciousnesses. Understanding, in his opinion, arises where two consciousnesses meet. Understanding is generally possible provided that there is another, understanding consciousness. “Dialogue relations cannot be understood in a simplified and one-sided way, reducing them to contradiction, struggle to dispute, disagreement.

Dialogic relations are much wider than dialogic speech in the narrow sense of the word,” the researcher writes [3, p. 321]. According to Bakhtin, alien consciousnesses cannot be contemplated, analyzed, defined as things - you can only communicate with them dialogically. “Dialogue lines cross the entire field of living human thinking” [3, p. 316]. M. Bakhtin believed that dialogic relations are an almost universal phenomenon that permeates all relations and manifestations of human life. He was sure: where consciousness begins, dialogue begins there. Humanitarian thinking is dialogical in nature, it is directed at a person as a cultural subject and, ultimately, focused on meaning. It was M. Bakhtin who outlined the new methodology of humanitarian knowledge, affirmed the central importance of dialogue in culture, the special role of the polyphony of cultures. E. Golovleva notes that M. Bakhtin also “expressed the idea of out-of-home: we ask other culture questions that she didn’t ask herself, because an individual of one culture understands another culture based on his own cultural experience” [3, p.27].

V.S.Bibler deepened, expanded, clarified the very concept of a dialogue of cultures developed by M.M.Bakhtin. V.S.Bibler feels M.M.Bakhtin as his conspiratorial minded. He, agreeing with him in his views on culture, writes: “culture not only is understood, but also arises (as a culture) in attempts to answer (to oneself, to one’s deeds and creations) the question of man-made forms of

“otherworldly being ” in other pre-imagined cultures. In M. Bakhtin: “The culture does not have its own territory” [7, p. 37]. The phenomenon of culture, wrote V. Bibler, “All the decisive events of life and the consciousness of people of our century” [7, p. 261]. He believed that "every culture is a kind of" two-faced Janus. “Her face is as intensely turned towards a different culture, to her being in other worlds, as well as inward, deep into herself, in an effort to change and complement her being ”[7, p. 37]. The dialogue of cultures is “a situation of a collision of fundamentally irreducible “cultures of thinking, various forms of understanding” [7]. Reflecting on the essence of such a concept as a “cultural phenomenon”, V. Bibler does not consider it separately from the dialogue, because in dialogue with predecessors, contemporaries and descendants, the scientist believes, one can understand the true meaning of culture. V. Bibler warned against a primitive understanding of dialogue and argued that “in the dialogue of cultures we are talking about the dialogism of truth itself, that understanding another person requires mutual understanding.

The dialogue understood in the idea of culture is not a dialogue of different opinions or ideas, it is always a dialogue of different cultures ” [2; p.132-133]. In his works, he argued that any culture is formed and revealed only in the dialogue between the past and the future. It was also significant for V.S.Bibler that, outside the dialogue, culture “dissolves” in the consciousness of its separate carrier and, thereby, loses its unique features. The originality is revealed only in the dialogue.

Thus, M. Bakhtin used the principle of dialogism of cultures in terms of literary criticism, V. Bibler developed on this basis a pedagogical concept. These studies are especially relevant for the entire modern school as a whole, including the national school.

The principle of dialogue, permeating the sphere of intercultural communication, means respect and recognition of all national cultures in the structure of modern world culture. The importance of dialogue in this regard is not



accidental. "Dialogue is considered not only as a heuristic device for assimilating knowledge, but also as a factor determining the essence and meaning of the transmitted information" [6, p. 243]. It is also important that the dialogue gives practical meaning to the interaction of cultures and is the basis for the development of such interaction. V. Lukov notes that the emergence of intercultural communication as a special branch of knowledge is one of the examples of concretizing the idea of a dialogue of cultures, which is so relevant in the context of globalization and multiculturalism.

In the process of coexistence and collision of various cultural worlds, the modern meeting of cultures creates the need for joint and compatible knowledge of other cultures, which allows you to remove possible negative stereotypes and clichés. In this regard, great attention is paid to tolerance - a sense of tolerance and respect for the culture and opinions of other people, the willingness to accept others as they are and to interact with them on the basis of consent, but without prejudice to their own interests. Because of this, the priority goals and objectives of modern education is to educate citizens of a legal democratic state with high morality and tolerance - national and religious tolerance, respect for the languages, traditions and culture of other nations, the formation of a culture of peace and interpersonal relations. It is based on a positive image of its cultural group with a positive value attitude to other ethnic groups.

Dialogue is the most important methodological principle of understanding culture. The problem of the contact of two different national worlds, their repulsion and attraction is not simple, therefore, a dialogue of literature helps to educate not just national tolerance, but respect for another people through its culture. The dialogue of cultures is a constant factor in almost all spheres of human activity, modern life. But the urgent task is to establish a successful and productive intercultural dialogue in all areas of life.

The inclusion of students in the dialogue of cultures is very important from

the point of view of their education and upbringing, since “the formation of a culture person, a spiritual person always occurs due to a dialogue of cultures - native and foreign” [7, p. 43]. It is essential for us that dialogue, at the same time, is a means of forming and developing intercultural competence, which is formed precisely in the process of dialogical communication.

### **References:**

1. Bogdanova, O.Yu. Leonova S.A., Chertova V.F. Methods of teaching literature. A textbook for university students enrolled in pedagogical specialties. M.: Academ. A, 1999
2. Boldyrev V.E. Introduction to the theory of intercultural communication, lecture course. M.: Russian language, 2009
3. Grishaeva L.I., Tsurikova L.V. Introduction to the theory of intercultural communication. Tutorial. 5th edition, revised and supplemented. M.: Academy, 2008
4. Gudkov D.B. Text perception algorithm and intercultural communication. Q: Language, consciousness, communication. Vol. 1, M.: Philology, 1997
5. Leontovich O.A. Intercultural transformation of personality. // Intercultural communication: research and teaching paradigms: Materials of an international scientific-practical conference. Krasnoyarsk: RIO KSPU, 2003
6. Likhachev D.S. The future of literature as a subject of study. New World No. 9, 1969
7. Makhkamova G.T. The ideas of progressivism in the training of foreign language specialists (in the system of higher professional education of the Republic of Uzbekistan). October 2010