Dialogue of Culture vs Non-Dialogue of Cultures in Woke World: Case of Foreign Language Teaching

Elena G. Tareva*a and Boris V. Tarevb

aMoscow City University
бNational Research University Higher School of Economics
Moscow, Russian Federation

Abstract. As the subject of the research the article discusses the dynamics of the axiosphere of methodology of teaching foreign languages to Russian students. The aim of the paper is rethinking of the phenomenon of *culture* and the change of its status in the structure of linguodidactic conceptology. The authors applying different methods (literature analysis, comparative, and content study), show external and internal factors that lead to change in scientific dominants due to the shifts of educational paradigms. The study demonstrated how these changes are formalized in the linguistic educational context using the example of the key concept *dialogue of cultures*. As a result, this approach reveals modern trends of *non-dialogue of cultures* in the process of intercultural communication. The achieved results are important for transformation of language education because of the latest geopolitical context.

Keywords: culture, woke culture, foreign language teaching, culture-based approach, dialogue, non-dialogue.

Research area: Theory and History of Culture, Art (Cultural Studies).

* Corresponding author E-mail address: elenatareva@mail.ru; boristarev@mail.ru

Диалог культур vs не-диалог культур: обучение иностранному языку в воук мире

Е. Г. Тарева[а], Б. В. Тарев[б]

[а]Московский городской педагогический университет
[б]Национальный исследовательский университет
«Высшая школа экономики»
Российская Федерация, Москва

Аннотация. В качестве объекта исследования в статье рассматривается вопрос трансформации аксиосферы современной лингводидактики, фундаментальные основания которой находятся в состоянии кардинального пересмотра своих постулатов под воздействием объективных внешних обстоятельств и изменений на уровне парадигматических научных сдвигов. Среди наиболее заметных и значимых изменений в этой области переосмысление феномена *культура*, переоценка его статуса в структуре лингводидактической концептологии, что составляет цель исследования. Авторы, на основе исследовательских методов (анализа литературы, компаративного анализа и контент-анализа) вскрывают и описывают влияние внешних и внутренних факторов, ведущих к выдвижению новых приоритетов в области образовательной парадигматики. В статье показано, каким образом сформировавшиеся изменения опредмечены в образовательном контексте на примере ключевого концепта лингводидактики *диалог культур* в его оппозиции *не-диалогу культур* – феномену, с недавнего времени активно включенному в переосмысление процесса подготовки обучающихся к межкультурной коммуникации. Полученные в ходе исследования результаты важны для трансформации отечественной системы языкового образования с учетом изменений современного геополитического контекста.

Ключевые слова: культура, воук культура, обучение иностранным языкам, культуро ориентированный подход, диалог, не-диалог.

Научная специальность: 5.10.1 – теория и история культуры, искусства.

Introduction

Rapidly developing political and socio-economic processes put forward new demands on various spheres and areas of humanitarian knowledge, which is undergoing serious transformations associated with the challenges of our time. These challenges are primarily due to the blurring of the boundaries of "normal" science, the introduction of liberal ideas into it that challenge or question established dogmas. Particularly complex from this point of view is a new trend called *wokeism*. According to the explanatory dictionary Dictionary.com (https://www.dictionary.com/), this trend means the promotion of liberal progressive ideology and policy as an expression of sensitivity to systemic injustices and prejudices (https://www.dictionary.com/browse/wokeism). As J. I. Gonzalez Cedillo points out, "The term "woke" is used as derogatory for progressives by conservatives and the far-right, due to its popularization on social media and traditional media" (Gonzalez Cedillo,

2023: 83). Woke ideology means "American progressivism of the left", which is perceived as an ideological attempt to change European culture to eliminate national identities.

In recent years, the phenomenon of "wokeism" has been actively studied in the foreign scientific community, mainly in the context of harsh opposition to this phenomenon. There is an 'anti-woke' culture war, which is studied from the standpoint of political discourse analysis, the discourse-historical approach and discourse-conceptual analysis (Cammaerts, 2022; Davies, MacRae, 2023).

The emerging disposition of opinions is interesting from the point of view of understanding the essence of modern political and social trends; the very formulation of the question of woke culture and the associated "cancel culture" served as a reason for revising many socially significant rules, norms, and traditions in favor of the admissibility of "abnormalisation of social justice" (Cammaerts, 2022). The revision (and sometimes radical transformation) also affected educational concepts. Because of such changes, areas related to inclusive education, tolerant attitudes towards low-achieving students, racial differences, etc. have become entrenched in educational studies (Grant, 2019; Topalidis, Austin, 2023; Tan, Padilla, Lambert, 2022). Under the influence of neoliberal ideas, significant changes of students are noticeable (Cole, Heinecke, 2020).

The current trends could not but influence the methodology of teaching foreign languages. Until now, it has existed in the space of developed linguistic educational concepts, methods and progressive practices. The seemingly unshakable postulates of linguodidactics were a positive relativistic attitude towards the target culture and its speakers, a focus on a productive dialogue of cultures with a foreign communication partner. Language was considered exclusively as a means, an instrument for immersing the student in another culture, expanding his own vision of the world. It was this content that filled educational programs, teaching materials, textbooks, in which the native culture was considered only as a picture for comparison, for finding similarities and differences in the worldview and understanding of representatives of different cultures.

From the standpoint of values (or anti-values?) of today, the idealization of such a target setting becomes clear. The dialogue of cultures has turned from an expected reality into an unrealizable myth (the authors (Baryshnikov, Vartanov, 2018) write about this). A new reality is "bursting" into the science of teaching foreign languages, forcing researchers to think in the paradigm of a non-dialogue of cultures or "acceptable understanding" during the dialogue of cultures. In our discussions below, we will focus on these new linguodidactical realities in terms of their positioning as new values, understanding their status in the methodological system and their role in the transformation of foreign language teaching technologies.

Theoretical (paradigmatic) framework

The dynamics of scientific paradigms is an extremely interesting object for research, since it allows us to comprehend knowledge "in motion", to investigate its origins, current state, and development prospects. Studying of scientific paradigms allows to comprehend, and therefore, to describe, explicate, interpret, and fix the dominant image of the world and the individual in a certain socio-historical epoch. The paradigm that has proved its basic parameters draws the attention of scientists. In its outlines they try to find explanations for the previously inexplicable, for new trends troubling humanity, to determine the origins of existence and the prospects for the development of history.

It is significant that of interest is not only a paradigm as itself, but also the process of its transformation, modification or replacement by another paradigm objectified by various conditions. The modification or "withering away" of one paradigm in the name of the "triumph" of another demonstrates the inner logic of science, its steady, progressive renewal. Analyzing the paradigm shifts, it should be noted that at any time the image of science is a kind of "mold" of the culture of civilization, which is predetermined by the whole course of complicated and contradictory development of culture, flexibly reacting to its demands. It is the demands of the world community, the geopolitical alignment

of forces that influence the paradigm shift both in socio-political and economic development, and in the sphere of science and technologies (practices) of transforming a person and his environment.

The new information era determines the modern paradigmatic way of scientific knowledge, which focuses mostly on the factors of *spiritual* and *cultural* properties, whose role in the future will only increase and become dominant. It is obvious that the main value of the state should be *the national mentality, the national culture, the moral image of the member of the society – the bearer of the national identity.*

The analysis of such trends in the aspect of their extrapolation into the sphere of linguodidactics, demonstrates that the special place in attempts to measure paradigms, novel for this area of knowledge, is taken by the field, which relates to the comprehension of *culture* as a key element of the methodological system (Piątkowska, 2015; Tareva, Tarev, 2017). The role and significance of culture-based scientific grounds are generally correlated with the cultural paradigm declared in the social and humanitarian field of knowledge. From a philosophical point of view, it allows in a peculiar way to measure the logic of culture and determine the parameters of root cultures – cultures that can sustainably reproduce themselves in the course of history. In this sense, the cultural paradigm is viewed as a pattern and a scheme that people use for the solution of life problems within the framework of a particular culture. At the core of this paradigm is the assertion that the distinction of root cultures is based on different perceptions of what is *ideally proper* for a human being. It is "*the storage of a sample"* that underlies the stability of any cultural tradition. At the same time, the cultural paradigm proclaims the priority of reflexivity – rational schemes of thinking and activity. This distinguishes it from cultural stereotypes that manifest themselves, as a rule, in the form of intuitive-reflective patterns of behavior and attitudes, and from simulacra – devalued by time degenerate models.

In connection with what has been said above, the image of the education system in the space of the cultural paradigm becomes obvious: educa-tion finds itself in the constant search for models (schemes) adequate (reflectively corresponding) to the contemporary type of culture and the actual stage of development of the state and society. In this perspective, culture plays the role of a mechanism for the self-preservation of society, a means of its adaptation to the surrounding world. In this quality it is culture that becomes the key element of the *culture-based approach* marking the modern stage of the development of pedagogy – the science of education.

The role and significance of these methodological grounds is so great that in scientific circles the question of the parameters of the culture-based educational paradigm is discussed. It involves the development, first, of the culturological components of education, the reproduction of an individual as a subject of culture. In this case, education begins *to reflect the space of culture*, to respond to its content and forms of existence and expression. In the basis of three key paradigms: the cognitive-information, competence and person-oriented ones lies the *culturological paradigm*. Disavowal of this obvious fact leads both to the distortion of the goals of education, and to the loss of genuine subjectivity in the pedagogical process. It should be concluded that culture-based approach changes both the concept of *culture*: it becomes personally conditioned, and the concept of *personality*: a culturally defined vector of interpretation of this concept is manifested, meaning the search for self-determination of an individual in culture (Kim, 2020).

Nowadays, the culture-based paradigm experiences difficulties of self-identification, connected with multiple acceptable images underlying education, as well as with the possibility of distortion of previously indisputable guidelines in the field of education and upbringing. In addition, the previously mentioned "cancel culture", "woke culture" blur the uniformity of value, moral rules and norms of behavior, social interaction at different levels, including in the process of intercultural communication.

Methods

The study is based on the use of the following methods: qualitative and mixed methods, with a strong focus on ethics. We conduct re-

search in a wide range of theoretical and methodological approaches from the field of cultural studies, linguoculturology, political science, pedagogy, linguodidactics. Using the method of discourse analysis makes it possible to describe dialogue of cultures and non-dialogue of cultures at different levels of research. Observational and action research approaches are widely used, as are evaluation methods.

Statement of the problem

Over the past three decades, the theory and practice of foreign language education has rethought the paradigmatic foundations through the prism of the cultural specifics of the acquisition a communication code as a means of achieving understanding between representatives of two different cultures. It is the *culture-based paradigm of linguodidactics* that has a specific profile for foreign language teaching. Its parameters, being a constitute part of a general system of the cultural paradigm (Ang, 2020; Woo, 2020; McEvoy, 2022), are subject-specific and allow us to conditionally differentiate linguodidactics from other sciences and fields of knowledge. Only within the framework of this paradigm, it is possible to comprehend models and schemes of teaching a learner to participate in a dialogue with representatives of different cultural communities. It can, therefore, be argued that the basic ground for the current stage of the development of linguodidactics is *cultural orientation of the system of education* (Garrett-Rucks, Jansa, 2020). It is this orientation that determines the specific (for a given scientific field) parameters of the general pedagogical paradigms of the modern information age: anthropocentric, axiological, cognitive, competence oriented.

Culture has always been an indispensable component of the conceptual sphere of linguodidactics: a foreign language was a conductor of culture, as its consolidator, and an instrument of transmission to the younger generation. In the classical period, culture was regarded exclusively in its correlation with the country of the target language. Hence the widespread expressions such as "teaching language and culture", "the co-study of language and culture", which formed the essence of language

learning Country Studies and Linguocultural Studies Courses. The popularity of this trend was dictated by the emerging social, political, economic factors, the removal of formal barriers in interaction with foreign countries.

Simultaneously with the domestic (Russian) circumstances, the external forces, particularly the interests of foreign companies, engaged in the promotion of Western standards in education through the "soft power" of the Bologna process, which brought the "truth" and "verity" of European educational values to the Russian educational community, which did not always correspond to the needs of our country. The standards created based on the Bologna ideology (for example, CEFR), the developed levels of foreign language proficiency, the written textbooks broadcast the European picture of the world, which we often presented as a role model without critical analysis. The authors sought (albeit implicitly, secretly, but persistently and systematically) the priority positions of their culture in comparison with the native culture of Russian-speaking students. Authors show how culture of French-speaking countries is shown exclusively in positive tones in the bulk of the textbooks of French publishers, while the native culture is ignored (at best, the task of presenting one's country is sometimes formulated) (Tareva, Schepilova, Tarev, 2017).

Evaluating these data self-critically, it should be recognized that in the dissemination of foreign teaching materials, and along with them of the "Western" way of life, we ourselves are largely to blame. Firstly, the textbooks published abroad are aimed primarily at potential emigrants and their (textbooks) goal is to maximize the rapid integration of students into a new social environment, and at the same time acculturation. Secondly, Russian system of foreign language textbooks revision, which used to be a serious barrier to the penetration of ideologically unacceptable materials, was "stalled" in the 1990s and was abolished to ensure maximum liberalization of educational opportunities (rather for lobbying pro-Western training models). Thirdly, teachers of foreign languages who for many years acted in the conditions of information "hunger" were fascinated by the

new formats of foreign textbooks and for a long time did not recognize (and maybe do not recognize) laid down in them negative (from the point of view of formation of students' *national* identity) "*raisons d'être*".

It becomes clear that with such an orientation of the process of teaching language and culture, conditions inevitably arose the prerequisites for ethnocentrism, leading to hypertrophy of the features of a different – target – culture. The consequences of this attitude to culture as a linguistic educational value are well known and described in detail (Borden, 2007; Adams, Hanna, 2012; Hales, Edmonds, 2018; Garrett-Rucks, Jansa, 2020; Kim, 2020). The focus is given to *one* of the cultures interacting in the process of learning a foreign language: either *target*, or *native* culture. Inevitably, the emerging imbalance of cultures can lead to the elitism of one of them, which can automatically lead to understatement of the role and significance of the other. A certain kind of "monocultural centrism" is becoming obvious – one culture is placed in the center, and the second (most often native) acts as a means of "immersing" in it (Intercultural foreign language education…, 2014: 24).

Even more controversial is the direction actively promoted some time ago. This is the so-called transcultural education (Casinader, 2017; Smith, Segbers, 2018; Casinader, Walsh, 2019). Its appearance, as one might assume, was dictated by the neoliberal ideas of postmodernism, which led to the emergence and strengthening of woke ideology. The learner sees both cultures as "from above": he leaves the power of his culture, overcomes bias, prejudgments of the evaluation of another culture and does not try to find compromise between cultures (Neike, 2000). Due to this, it acquires the ability to live in the space of universal universals (for example, they include the concepts "peace", "justice", "environmental protection", etc.). It is transculturalism that is proclaimed today as a value of the global woke world; it has truly become a symbol of the openness of a multicultural society in a heterogeneous environment, a dynamic institutional process of penetration into a system of another culture.

Obviously, with this view, the world becomes uniform and monochrome, while it is multi-polar and heterogeneous. A person is deprived of his cultural and social diversity. The danger of transcultural education, therefore, is to ignore the constantly (and violently!) ongoing processes of social, political, cultural changes. In this sterile image of the world there is no place for the diversity accompanying the world order. A human being artificially moves beyond the natural course of events within which he must evolve as a member of society.

Discussion
The concept of teaching dialogue of cultures

As a response to ethnocentric and transcultural views in linguodidactics appears (at the end of the twentieth century) and begins to actively promote itself the concept of teaching the dialogue of cultures. According to researchers (Hermans, Hermans-Konopka, 2010; Boyd, Markarian, 2011; Zhou, 2019; Allan, 2003; Blanc, 2023), dialogue of cultures is a form and way of communication between representatives of different cultures, when each side recognizes the other as equal, shows interest in it, realizes its differences, respects uniqueness, and deepens its identity through cognition and comparison. Dialogue of cultures leads to ethnorelativism, to cultural egalitarianism – comprehension of another culture and through it rethinking of one's own. The student's picture of world is enriched under the powerful influence of a) another culture, b) own culture, c) interaction (dialogue) of these cultures. Under the influence of "secondary" acculturation, a change in the "primary" acculturation occurs; "secondary" acculturation is interpreted as the process of assimilating the norms and values of a foreign culture necessary for life and positively perceived, because of which a "rethinking" of native culture takes place, i.e. a change in "primary acculturation". Regarding this understanding of the dialogue of cultures, the point of view of U. Zeuner is of particular importance. He says that a person in the process of intercultural communication acquires unique abilities associated with the "reactivation" of his own culture. To these abilities he relates:

• ability to recognize the prerequisites for understanding a foreign cultural fact from the standpoint of one's own culture;

- ability to understand a foreign culture from the point of view of its representatives;

- ability to mediate between one's own and another's culture, which implies a willingness and ability to respect the identity and originality of another culture while belonging to one's own cultural origin (Zeuner, 2001).

The student, therefore, makes considerable efforts to adopt target cultural characteristics of perception, critical thinking, mode of action. At the same time, he strives to comprehend the phenomenon of native culture. Moreover, the latter is as significant as the former. In other words, the focus of the student's attention is given to objects of equal importance: native culture ceases to be a means of immersion in the originality of another society, it becomes the same goal of mastery as the culture of representatives of the country of the target language.

With this in mind, we can describe the dialogue of cultures as that ideal (that leading value) that characterizes the current stage of development (transformation) of a culture-oriented paradigm in linguodidactics. A new *intercultural linguistic ideology* is emerging, which today determines the course and outcome of the process of teaching a foreign language as a subject in the system secondary and (especially) higher education. What has been said in full, as one can conclude, contradicts the ideology of woke culture and the transcultural approach: a person does not lose his identity, acquiring knowledge about another picture of the world, another way of life and activity, he enriches his understanding of the multipolarity of the surrounding space, about multiple acceptable realities, ideas and values. This allows us to resist xenophobia, ethnocentrism, to achieve cultural, valueless relativism as an episteme of modernity.

Teaching based on the dialogue of cultures can withstand several negative factors: the effects of stereotyping, conflict of opposing value and cultural orientations, deculturation and loss of cultural nature, cultural exaltation, artificial acculturation, absence of differentiation between cultural phenomena. The intercultural approach helps students to develop of relativistic reflection, cultural synthesis and true cultural integration.

Non-dialogue of cultures: modern challenges

There is a solution to the problem associated with the modernization of foreign language education, directing it towards the achievement of an educational ideal that seemed close and easily achievable. But illusions were not given to come true. The period of rethinking the seemingly yesterday unshakable ideologies began, related to the desire for world order, for friendship between peoples, for peaceful and conflict-free coexistence of various states. Such "slogans" today turned out to be unclaimed by history because of their unrealizability and even some naivety. Today, these attitudes are particularly unattainable under the influence of woke trends that distort differences, deny abnormality and entail permissiveness at the level of culture, social relations and even political processes. The tough time of confrontation between various political, economic, cultural systems has come, the eternal struggle for leadership on a global scale has entered a new stage. There is a need for new ideological postmodern constructs, among which the major item is the formation and affirmation in the minds of people of openness, tolerance, freedom of expression, the supremacy of one's own rights and desires over public and generally recognized ones, bordering on permissiveness (freedom from any regulations, norms and rules).

The education system, including a foreign language, must find adequate answers to these challenges. And the main issue that requires revision and reassessment is the preparation of students for a dialogue of cultures as an educational ideal. Among Russian and foreign authors, the opinion has arisen that a dialogue of cultures is nothing more than a metaphor that describes an ideal educational construct – a desired but unattainable image that is not viable either in terms of formulating the goal of teaching a foreign language or in terms of developing effective technologies for its implementation.

Among such skeptics we include the position of N. V. Baryshnikov, who believes that cultures do not dialogue with each other, verbal dialogue is carried out by representatives of different cultures, each of which has

an individual level of culture. The dialogue of cultures as a concept of teaching FL is not justified, since there is no dialogue of cultures in the student audience, because students and the teacher are representatives of one, in an integrated sense, Russian culture (Baryshnikov, Vartanov, 2018). The authors especially pay attention to the "unequal status of cultures" suggesting the suppression of one culture by another, talking about the dangers of politicization and ideologization of the learning process in the context of dialogue of cultures. Rejecting the dialogue of cultures in a conceptual sense, the scientist declares that in practical terms it is necessary to make certain corrections in understanding the significance of such a dialogue. They offer to call the dialogue of cultures a technology including special exercises and trainings for preparing for real intercultural dialogue.

J. Qian focuses on dialogue as part of knowledge production within academic communities, identifying the institutional challenges and power inequalities that fetter dialogues between Western academia and beyond (Qian, 2018). Other researchers raise several questions concerning the potential of limitations to dialogue in an age of increasing social tensions and political divides (Rose-Redwood, Kitchin, Rickards, Rossi, Datta, Crampton, 2018). An interesting view is given by P. Murphy, who reflects on the paradoxical nature of all discursive models of dialogue. He argues that all forms of dialogue that rely on discursive interaction run into the problem of incommensurable values, principles, and ultimate authorities (Murphy, 2011). S. Srivastava speculates about the recognition of the impossibility of dialogue provides an understanding of the state of global and local asymmetries and the specificity of the quotation (Srivastava, 2018).

The postmodern times, cancel culture, woke ideology have strengthened the emerging trends in science. Modern ideas of the liberal West are in conflict with traditional values. As a result, there are more reasons for non-dialogue between cultures. This leads to misunderstanding between people, difficulty in communication. This leads to contradictions that are resolved by radical means, including military ones.

Cancel culture or cancelling and woke culture provoke aggressive discourse in the interaction of representatives of different social groups and bearers of different cultural identities, various forms of confrontational non-constructive communication, accompanied by previously taboo ways and means of expressing threats, insults, mockery, ridicule, etc. The above suggests that non-dialogue of cultures is becoming a reality today in the interaction of representatives of different communities and nationalities. This means that conclusions should follow about new educational guidelines in the field of teaching foreign languages, relevant in the conditions of cancelling and woke culture.

Dialogue or non-dialogue
in language education.
That is the question!

Judgments about the potentially negative didactic potential of the dialogue of cultures are due to several reasons. Firstly, in the learning environment in the absence of a native speaker, it is difficult to create a genuine intercultural environment to prepare for interaction with a partner. Thus, it is difficult to provide conditions for an invaluable comparison of diverse cultural facts and phenomena. This difficulty lies in the fact that in most educational situations, a native speaker as a partner in intercultural communication is absent. There is no way to enter direct interaction with him, which means to ensure "dialogic" interaction to compare points of view, opinions and, on this basis, develop ideas about the possibility of multidirectional interpretation of the same cultural fact: values, ideas, customs, etc.

Secondly, the very idea of a dialogue of cultures implies the possibility of a manipulative impact on its participants / one of the participants (this was mentioned above) due to the impossibility of ensuring "mirroring" of their interaction, equal status of communicators, in other words, equality of representatives of two societies. Without proper preparation for this kind of communication, there is a high probability of a change in the aspect of demean-

ing ideas about the native culture, as a result, changes in value judgments about national values, and priorities.

In relation to the first of these arguments, didactic decisions can be made that alleviate the severity of the problem. Indeed, the dialogue of cultures is difficult, but it is by no means impossible. Thus, in the process of reading, listening, or writing, a student without any problems joins intercultural interaction due to various discursive practices, implemented online. In this case, the dialogue does not cease to be dialogue. In fact, the dialogue that determines the comparison of the two cultures takes place in the student's mind when he actualizes the complex cognitive processes of comparison, diversification, and the identification of the common and different. Such dialogue is facilitated by regular reading and listening to audio and television programs in a foreign language, communication in social networks and instant messengers. The limitless possibilities of direct Internet communication make the idea of ensuring the authenticity of the student's interaction with people from different countries who speak the target language feasible. As for the second argument, didactic solutions to this problem cannot be easy, since in this case a non-dialogue of cultures is very likely. The following steps are possible to ensure the equivalence of interacting cultures.

As for the second argument, didactic solutions to this problem cannot be easy, since in this case a non-dialogue of cultures is very likely. The following steps are possible to ensure the equivalence of interacting cultures:

• The inclusion of students' native culture should be ensured in the content of teaching a foreign language. In this case the educational potential of the subject "Foreign Language" is greatly enhanced, primarily in fostering love and respect for the Motherland, students are motivated not to be ashamed of their country, but be proud of it, strengthen their national identity, mentality.

This teaching strategy is implemented using two socio-communicative contexts that are thematically connected but relate to different cultural realities (different countries). For example, two texts on the topic of "Relationships between children and parents" can be offered: one reflecting the realities of the student's native country, the other presenting the positions on this issue characteristic of the country of the studied language. During the discussion, ideas about the issue under consideration are compared, similar and distinctive features of value priorities are identified. The student draws conclusions, immersing himself in the context of two interacting realities. Such techniques as intercultural commenting, onomaseological comparison of linguistic phenomena (Vikulova, Tareva, Serebrennikova, Gerasimova, Rayskina, 2020), interculturally directed textbooks of foreign languages, study of diverse aesthetic pictures of the world (Koptseva, Smolina, Reznikova, Razumovskaya, 2019) can help a student to perceive it.

• It is necessary to raise and solve the question of preparing students for those communicative acts that are associated with communicative aggression, manipulation, latent and explicit indoctrination, the presentation of explicit and implicit "fake", false information to influence the emotional and valuable state of the interlocutor. The peculiarities of intercultural conflict communication are described in modern linguistic literature (Claudel, von Munchow, Pordeus Ribeiro, Pugniere-Saavedra, Treguer-Felten, 2013). Such training provides students with manipulative strategies for intercultural dialogue, communicative self-defense, and communicative attacks can discourage the aggressive use of "black rhetoric" based on lies and deceit.

Teaching strategies and tactics of communicative behavior in a conflict-generating environment requires special didactic solutions. First of all, it is necessary to supplement the content of the training with linguistic means that reflect the implicit (hidden) or clearly aggressive intentions of the interaction partner. In addition, students must master the art of decision-making in a conflict communication situation: change the topic, refuse to continue the conversation, convince themselves of their rightness, etc.

• A fairly new phenomenon in linguodidactics is the "acceptable dialogic understanding" achieved in the conditions of a

non-dialogue of cultures. As is known, the cognitive spaces of two individuals do not coincide completely, especially these discrepancies are obvious when communicating with foreigners on issues that are fundamentally different in two linguacultures. But if a consensus must be reached between the communication partners, the "intersection zone" of these spaces is actualized, which is capable of ensuring a coincidence of presuppositions that are a necessary condition for any communication, including communication based on a conflict situation. The admissibility of understanding in this case means the admissibility of the coordination of interacting ideas about the world. The admissibility of the equality of conceptual spaces leads the participants in communication to search for compatible value priorities. And dialogue takes place. If the combination of ideas on the issue under discussion is impossible, dialogue is not realized. There is a refusal to communicate.

Acceptable understanding is a difficult communicative skill to master. It largely depends on experience and the abundance of practice in intercultural communication, on a person's reflexive abilities, their inclination to critical thinking, etc. The main thing is to demonstrate to students precedents of such communication, where not one, but several solutions are acceptable, where the participants in the interaction compromise, coordinating their and other positions in order to achieve consensus.

Conclusion

From the foregoing, it follows that modern linguodidactic knowledge is in a state of rethinking the idea of a dialogue of cultures, and this rethinking underlies the modern transformation of the culture-oriented paradigm of foreign language education. It is time to abandon the ideal in its essence maxim "to teach a dialogue of cultures" for the sake of preparing students for the conditions of a non-dialogue of cultures – a reality that is currently decisive in interaction with representatives of the neoliberal world, who are entering into an open confrontation with established conservative values. The new target setting "preparation for a non-dialogue of cultures" requires changes at the level of both content-target and technological didactic solutions. The main thing to understand is that classical models of teaching a foreign language are not relevant in these conditions. New methods, techniques, and tools are needed that can immerse students in a new communicative reality, in a situation of misunderstanding other systems of views on the world. This seems to be a new path for the development of linguodidactics.

References

Adams M., Hanna P. Your past is not their present: Time, the other, and ethnocentrism in cross-cultural personality psychology. In: *Theory & Psychology*, 2012, 22(4), 436–451. DOI: 10.1177/0959354311412107

Allan M. Frontier Crossings: Cultural dissonance, intercultural learning and the multicultural personality. In: *Journal of Research in International Education,* 2003, 2(1), 83–110. DOI: 10.1177/1475240903021005.

Ang I. On cultural studies, again. In: *International Journal of Cultural Studies,* 2020, 23(3), 285–291. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877919891732

Baryshnikov N. V., Vartanov A. V. Ten 'whys' about intercultural communication. In: *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, 2018, 677, 219–230.

Blanc E. Recognition through dialogue: How transatlantic relations anchor the EU's identity. In: *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 2023, 25(1), 102–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/13691481211058015

Borden A. W. The impact of service-learning on ethnocentrism in an intercultural communication course. In: *Journal of Experiential Education,* 2007, 30(2), 171–183. DOI:10.1177/105382590703000206

Boyd M. P., Markarian W. C. Dialogic teaching: Talk in the service of a dialogic stance. In: *Language & Education*, 2011, 25(6), 515–534. DOI:10.1080/09500782.2011.597861

Cammaerts B. The abnormalisation of social justice: The 'anti-woke culture war' discourse in the UK. In: *Discourse & Society*, 2022, 33(6), 730–743. DOI:10.1177/0957926522109540

Casinader N. *Transnationalism, education and empowerment: The latent legacies of empire.* Abingdon: Routledge, 2017. 168.

Casinader N., Walsh L. Investigating the cultural understandings of International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme teachers from a transcultural perspective. In: *Journal of Research in International Education*, 2019, 18(3), 257–273. DOI:10.1177/1475240919891001

Claudel Ch., von Munchow P., Pordeus Ribeiro V., Pugniere-Saavedra F., Treguer-Felten G. *Cultures, discours, langues. Nouveaux abordages*. Limoges: Lambert-Lucas. 2013. 230.

Cole R. M., Heinecke W. F. Higher education after neoliberalism: Student activism as a guiding light. In: *Policy Futures in Education*, 2020, 18(1), 90–116. DOI:10.1177/1478210318767459

Davies H. C., MacRae S. E. An anatomy of the British war on woke. In: *Race & Class*, 2023, 65(2), 3–54. DOI:10.1177/03063968231164905

Garrett-Rucks P., Jansa T. For whom are we internationalizing? A call to prioritize second language learning in internationalization efforts. In: *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 2020, 15(1), 7–19. DOI:10.1177/1745499920901944

Gonzalez Cedillo J. I. Woke ideology: the perception of the Spanish far-right and its role in international relations. In: *Azimuth of Scientific Research: Economics and Administration*, 2023, 12(43), 83–86. DOI:1 0.57145/27128482_2023_12_02_18

Grant C. A. Race, Emotions, and Woke in Teaching. In: *Teachers College Record*, 2019, 121(13), 1–26. DOI: 10.1177/016146811912101302

Hales G., Edmonds B. Intragenerational cultural evolution and ethnocentrism. In: *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* 2018, 63(5), 1283–1309. DOI:10.1177/0022002718780481

Hermans H. J. M., Hermans-Konopka A. *Dialogical self-theory: Positioning and counter-positioning in a globalizing society.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 2010. 404.

Mezhkul'turnoye inoyazychnoye obrazovaniye: lingvodidakticheskiye strategii i taktiki [Intercultural Foreign Language Education: Linguo-Didactic Strategies and Tactics]. Moscow, Logos, 2014, 232.

Kim D. Learning language, learning culture: Teaching language to the whole student. In: *ECNU Review of Education*, 2020, 3(3), 519–541. https://doi.org/10.1177/2096531120936693

Koptseva N. P., Smolina M. G., Reznikova K. V., Razumovskaya V. A. Analysis of modern educational technologies for developing students' national-cultural identities through studying diverse aesthetic pictures of the world. In: *Science for Education Today*, 2019, 9(4), 247–259. DOI:10.15293/2658–6762.1904.15

McEvoy J. G. Cultural plurality and inculturation: Foundations for intercultural dialogue. In: *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 2022, 87(4), 259–279. https://doi.org/10.1177/00211400221127120

Murphy P. The paradox of dialogue. In: *Policy Futures in Education,* 2011, 9(1), 22–28. DOI:10.2304/pfie.2011.9.1.22

Neike W. *Interkulturelle Erziehung und Bildung. Weltorientierung im Alltag.* Opladen Leske + Budrich, 2000, 277.

Piatkowska K. From cultural knowledge to intercultural communicative competence: changing perspectives on the role of culture in foreign language teaching. In: *Intercultural Education,* 2015, 26(5), 397–408. DOI:10.1080/14675986.2015.1092674

Qian J. The possibilities of cosmopolitan dialogue. In: *Dialogues in Human Geography,* 2018, 8(2), 138–142. DOI:10.1177/2043820618780574

Rose-Redwood R., Kitchin R., Rickards, L., Rossi U., Datta A., Crampton J. The possibilities and limits to dialogue. In: *Dialogues in Human Geography,* 2018, 8(2), 109–123. DOI:10.1177/2043820618780566

Smith H. A., Segbers T. The impact of transculturality on student experience of higher education. In: *Journal of Experiential Education*, 2018, 41(1), 75–89. DOI:10.1177/1053825917750406

Srivastava S. On the merits of recognizing the near-impossibility of dialogue. In: *Dialogues in Human Geography,* 2018, 8(2), 133–137. DOI:10.1177/2043820618780572

Tan P., Padilla A., Lambert R. A Critical Review of Educator and Disability Research in Mathematics Education: A Decade of Dehumanizing Waves and Humanizing Wakes. In: *Review of Educational Research*, 2022, 92(6), 871–910. DOI: 10.3102/00346543221081874

Tareva E. G., Schepilova A. V., Tarev B. V. Intercultural content of a foreign language textbooks: concept, texts, practices. In: *XLinguae,* 2017, 10(3), 246–255. DOI: 10.18355/XL.2017.10.03.20

Tareva E. G., Tarev B. V. Intercultural education as a "soft power" tool. In: *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2017, 10(3), 432–439. DOI: 10.17516/1997–1370–0051.

Topalidis Y., Austin S. Documenting Black Faculty Experiences in the "Stop Woke" Era. In: *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 2023, 9(4), 550–555.

Vikulova L. G., Tareva E. G., Serebrennikova E. F., Gerasimova S. A., Rayskina V. A. Retrospective semiometrics of the sign valeur. In: *XLinguae*, 2020, 13(1), 169–183. DOI:10.18355/XL.2020.13.01.13

Woo B. Cultural studies and actually existing culture. In: *International Journal of Cultural Studies,* 2020, 23(3), 310–316. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877920903053

Zeuner U. *Landeskunde und interkulturelles Lernen*. Eine Einführung, Dresden, Technische Universität Dresden, 2001, 133.

Zhou X. Daoism and dialogism: A dialogue between China and the West. In: *Culture & Psychology,* 2019, 25(4), 517–543. DOI:10.1177/1354067X19845072