

## PhR 2019 Philological Readings

### EDUCATOR IN THE SPACE OF LINGUISTIC CULTURE

Aida V. Kiryakova (a)\*, Oleg V. Frolov (b)

\*Corresponding author

(a) The department of General and Vocational Pedagogics, Orenburg State University, 13, Pobedy Avenue, Orenburg, Russia, aida.osu@gmail.com

(b) The department of General and Vocational Pedagogics, Orenburg State University, 13, Pobedy Avenue, Orenburg, Russia, fov-osu@mail.ru

#### *Abstract*

The research is aimed at eliciting communicative problems of a modern educator in the space of linguistic culture in education. In the Russian Federation there are almost no similar studies of the contents of the linguistic culture, objectivizing the peculiarities of understanding cultural concepts of communicative interaction in the pedagogical practice. The authors believe that it is important to study the contents of linguistic culture, forming the concept of the linguistic persona of the educator in a relevant pedagogical reality, empirically with the help of methods of scientific research. The object of the research is the linguistic consciousness of a modern educator, which determines his position in the space of linguistic culture. In this context the authors define socio-cultural preconditions for establishing the discourse of linguistic culture which characterize multicultural educational space, determine the content of axiology in an educator's linguistic consciousness, describe the problematics of providing the ethical rules of verbal interaction of persons in the educational community on the level of axiological linguistic consciousness and determine the linguistic images of the main pedagogical values as axiological guides of pedagogical activity, which serve as a basis of educators' verbal behavior.

2357-1330 © 2020 Published by European Publisher.

**Keywords:** Communication, communicative interaction, culture, educator, linguistic culture, pedagogy.



## 1. Introduction

Under the conditions of crisis among the anthropocentric absolutes, an educator's personality, the culture of his professional activity, as well as communicative and linguistic culture are subjects of critical analysis. It is predetermined by the transformation of socio-cultural contacts, which are characterized by the conversion of relations between people, and the formation of new images of the real world, which determine the content and directions of human axiological consciousness, when "the rising waves of decoded information are falling on his nervous system, changing his attitude to the world at its root" (Toffler, 2008, p. 189), as well as the change in the language of culture, that is developing because of the inversion in the moral and spiritual regulation of human behavior.

## 2. Problem Statement

Let us refer to the statements of significant Russian and foreign researchers. Kirillova (2011) is convinced that new information technologies brought profound changes to human communication with the surrounding world (both natural and social) and they are rearranging the way of perceiving the world along with the lifestyle. Savrutskaya (2004, 2008, 2012) claims that at present a special communicative situation is being established, which supposes replacements and substitutions of traditional mechanisms and channels of broadcasting social and cultural experience and value-systems; the conditions of new informational environment expand the area of issues, aggravating the questions of culture of interaction, among which there are linguistic questions. The conclusion of Whorf (2003) still remains relevant. The researcher is sure that objectivization of new axiological setups and behavioral motifs, originated from the conditions of anomic situation, changing the connotations and meanings of collective ideas, changes the communicative space as well (Whorf, 2003). Horuzhaya (2012) has quite an adamant opinion in this respect, saying that in the fading system of socio-cultural relations, recessionary and degrading consciousness with weak reflective functions gets widespread.

Sharing the perspectives of the above-mentioned researchers, we can claim that the process of social degrading under the conditions of modern cultural crisis is reflected in the linguistic culture. Within this context it is very interesting to refer to the ideas of Benhabib (2003) who noticed that critical state of the society in the early XXI century was demonstrated in the language itself, and when the crisis transitioned to this very language, philology faced the problem of ability or disability of thinking.

So, what is the crisis of linguistic culture as a form of embodying socio-cultural and personal connotations? Let us give an answer to this question referring to renowned Russian philosophers and culturologists:

- the culture of masterpieces and geniuses is over and a modern cultural state has begun which is determined by projects, strategies, individual mythologies but not results. The world of culture is dehumanized, people's presence in it is not necessary and often it is even impossible (Fortunatova, 2012);
- the ethical rules of communication, historically formed in the linguocultural society are broken as well as the dialogical basis of the language, linguistic norms and culture of verbal behavior are being rejected, the prestige of high level of linguistic competence is denied, the pragmatic

whole of a linguistic persona is influenced in a negative way, Anglophone speech patterns are introduced in the language use (Lazutkina, 2017);

- the ecophilological problematics of contemporary society is originated from the decrease of common and verbal culture, which is connected with the renewal of lexical apparatus, often forcible and caused by the adoption of words, non-characteristic for the Russian traditional language terrain, as well as by actual removal of indigenous Russian language forms, a change of intonational stems of Russian speech, non-typical manner of pronunciation, when the speech loses its own cultural harnessing, and also by the dominance of physicality, plasticity, sound “chaos”, verbal “garbage”, absence of poetics, introducing computer technologies to almost all kinds of activity, including teaching, a change in plotting and imagery (Novikova, 2004; Hrolenko, 2017).

The logic of the cited statements goes along with the system of reflexive forms of cognition of modern linguistic culture, the universality of which is demonstrated through cultural semantics, mediating the ability of human beings to assess the results of their linguistic activity, to elaborate lingvo-axiological strategies of creating and interpreting a cultural text, which serve as a basis for constructed cognitive models in numerous situations of linguistic communication (Karpukhina, 2013). Some scholars disagree with this characteristic of the crisis of linguistic culture, insisting that the new times demand the mobility of the word, an upbringing of some other linguistic taste, which could satisfy the requirements of the information society, because it is the information that has become a life-providing product for our society. Its formulating is unable to tolerate anachronisms of the XX century with its heavy-weighted constructions, which do not document infringements of habitual norms but the meaning of which comes to the deformation of the human essence – the thought (Ivchenkov, 2012).

Such significant differences in the interpretation of scientific observations of the crisis of linguistic culture manifest that the conclusions of researchers depend on their beliefs and methodological strategies of conceptualizing the role of the language in cognition and scientific research. Linguistic situation which changed in the early XXI century has influenced the linguistic culture of an educator. According to Sklyarevskaya (2001), this linguistic situation can be described by the following processes of opposite directions: “scientification” of language which is shown through the adoption of terminology by the common language and the flows of borrowings on the one hand and the opposing motion of jargonization of language on the other.

In the context of the chosen problem we believe that it is the most appropriate to understand an educator’s linguistic culture as a special scheme of verbal behavior of the most important subject in the educational process, which provides cultural regulation and determines communicative direction of actions of the participants of cultural interaction in the dialogical format as a basis for communicative paradigm of professional activity. As it is was stated by Asadullin (2013), an educator is not a human being that is isolated from the outer world and that can live on their own. Therefore, current lexical processes marking “points of communicative and conceptual tension” are reflected in the educator’s speech and they characterize the linguistic situation of the time, and that is quite relevant and it is documented in the numerous studies of Russian and foreign scholars.

### **3. Research Questions**

The research problem is determined by the following number of issues. In the present study we make an attempt to define socio-cultural preconditions for establishing the discourse of linguistic culture which characterize multicultural educational space, determine the content of the axiology of an educator's linguistic consciousness, describe the problematics of providing the ethical rules of verbal interaction of persons in the educational community on the level of axiological linguistic consciousness and determine the linguistic images of the main pedagogical values as axiological guides of pedagogical activity which serve as a basis of educators' verbal behavior.

### **4. Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to reconsider the anthropocentric context of interaction between language and culture; to study and evaluate linguistic and communicative reality of the modern school (both comprehensive and higher) in the axiological regard; to examine the specifications of linguistic consciousness, forming the peculiarities of communicative behavior of an educator in the linguistic culture; to determine the character of linguistic communication in the problematic field of pedagogical culturology and axiology of education.

### **5. Research Methods**

To achieve the aims posed for the present study the following empirical methods were used: analytical interview; questionnaire survey; direct, indirect, overt observation; analysis of students' creative assignments; analysis of lessons (lectures, seminars); textual documentation of oral and written communication of school teachers and university lecturers; methods of mathematical analysis to calculate the obtained results.

### **6. Findings**

#### **6.1. Coverage of the problem of linguistic culture**

The analysis of research papers in the fields of educational philosophy, pedagogy, culturology, linguistics, linguistic culturology created in the last five years and published in Russian and international pedagogical, culturological and linguistic journals made it possible to define the relevance of study and to claim scientific interests. Conceptual setups of analyzed theoretical works evidence the development of a person's linguistic culture in the modern world which is caused by the problems of globalization in the social space, language status in various social groups, where the issues of dialogical interaction as of existential phenomena based on deep instinctive traits of human nature remain essential.

Linguistic persona appeared and permanently exists in the cultural space that is a regulative value-based system arranging life of societies where the language is a creative and innovative mechanism. In contemporary scientific literature linguistic culture is considered to be the axiological basis of a linguistic persona's verbal activity (B. N. Levina); the reflection of maturity and development of socially important personal qualities, which are actuated in individual verbal and communicative activities, an indicator of

qualitative development of knowledge, interests, beliefs, norms of activity and verbal behavior, functional literacy, social feelings and emotions (V. S. Bibler, L. N. Kogan, M. K. Mamardashvili, V. V. Serikov); the combination of normative, practical, ethic and ethical, personal and creative component, indicating the attitude to the mother tongue and its role (N. D. Nikandrov, A. I. Novikov, E. N. Shiyanov).

Russian educators actively study the issues of forming elements of linguistic culture of students (M. M. Kotlyar); the peculiarities of pedagogical system of forming linguistic culture of a professional under the conditions of continuous education (N. N. Solovyeva); technologies of forming linguistic professional culture (O. A. Demina); didactic conditions for the development of linguistic culture for students of non-linguistic syllabuses of higher education (N. A. Chilikova). The issues of developing linguistic culture are considered alongside the studies of the communicative culture of prospective educators (L. R. Vartanova), didactic conditions of forming students' intercultural competence (G. E. Potorochina), pedagogical bases for development of linguistic persona (G. A. Ivanova), communicative competence of foreign students, (N. V. Nemchenko), elaboration of methodology for teaching linguistic university students how to communicate in a foreign language under cross-cultural conditions (E. A. Kirichenko), linguocultural module of teaching a foreign language culture (I. A. Maskinskova).

Some researching educators have certain scientific interest in the pedagogical conditions of developing students' linguistic culture or in the didactic conditions for developing linguistic culture of students of non-linguistic faculties of humane universities (N. N. Mukimova, H. M. Bubiev). Foreign scholars more often address to the issues of linguistic culture with questions from various cultural and philosophical contexts (Afful, 2017; Opina, 2017; Chaaaraoui, 2017).

Having analyzed existing researches on this subject, we can state that linguistic culture being an essential factor of human activity in the context of deep criteria for verbal imagery "reveals" the person, who has undergone his own linguistic evolution, and dialogical perspective of which is uncovered through their notional actualization towards another person.

## **6.2. Research methodology: culturological and axiological approaches**

Methodological basis and theoretical sources of the present research are the works of philosophers (K. O. Apel, M. M. Bakhtin, G. Deleuse, E. Husserl, K. K. Jole, E. Cassirer, L. A. Mikeshina, L. Wittgenstein), axiologists (E. V. Babayeva, V. V. Boguslavskaya, W. Benjamin, G. F. Ivanova, G. Vattimo, G. O. Vinokur), culturologists (V. L. Benin, M. Cole, A. A. Guseynov, M. S. Kagan, Y. M. Lotman, V. M. Mezhuev), linguists (K. Hagege, N. D. Arutynova, A. V. Bondarenko, Y. N. Karaulov, A. R. Luria), pedagogues (V. A. Kan-Kalik, A. V. Fomin, L. P. Yakubinskiy). The above-mentioned scholars devoted their works to the nature of language, defined its connection to spiritual culture, determined the interrelations between consciousness and educator's professional activity. The analyzed works also presented studies of linguistic space in school as an expression of specific social and cultural reality in the variety of forms of communicative behavior of the professional educating society, which expresses social and cultural relations and values of all the subjects of educational process.

Ways to study the problem in the contexts of pedagogy, linguoculturology, philosophy and axiology of education include culturological and axiological approaches, combining value-based, notional and culturological analysis.

Culturological approach in its academic form considering the world of a person in the context of cultural existence made it possible to define the phenomenon of linguistic culture as a creative social and cultural force which is able to conceptualize subjective cultural ways of expressing meanings that are objectified in the language and to present linguistic culture as a sum of linguistic, cognitive and cultural spaces where there are linguistic contacts between representatives of contrastive lingvo-cultures, predefining the relations between communicators, being a matrix of deep and unconscious evaluation of each other.

Axiological approach made it possible to interpret the ensemble of axiological structures forming the value-based segment of linguistic world-image which defines the educator's communicative behavior in the linguistic spheres of cultural educational constants.

Linguistic consciousness of an educator as a socio-cultural result of conscious thinking which is formed with linguistic means, where language and thinking stand as a unified phenomenon, a sum of both person's knowledge of the world (world-image), and operational knowledge (the knowledge about language use) is determined by the presence of cultural concepts that form the image of the system of axiological models of professional behavior which reflects lingvo-creative potential connected with the possibility of turning pedagogical communication into a dialogue.

Theoretical and methodological analysis of the issue of posing an educator in the linguistic culture is objectively carried out in the framework of interdisciplinary research which is based on the following: critical reading and comprehension of philosophical, culturological, pedagogical and linguistic studies; the assessment of modern cultural-linguistic, psychological and pedagogical theories and concepts of language development; comprehension of the state of modern pedagogical discourse where personal value-based notional position of the participants of educational process is formed.

### **6.3. Research results**

The research has been carried out in Orenburg State University as well as in general academic schools of Orenburg region. Altogether 350 educators and 500 students took part in the research.

The chosen area of study (the educator in linguistic study) demands preliminary clarification of the specifics of professional pedagogical activity.

Pedagogical activity stands out as a cultural phenomenon, cultural text, the language of which can appropriately reflect the space of a professional whose actions are based on the necessity to solve anthropologic problems of social communication. It presents itself as cultural creativeness of connotations, ideals and values that form a Man. Pedagogical activity is a form of a special subculture of an educator where spiritual and intellectual core of the national tradition is transferred through spiritual experience and the mind of the teacher. This activity is principally dialogical; the dialogue is the standard of true pedagogical art and it poses itself as a sum of educator's qualities, as a unity of the inner and the outer, the material and the ideal, the technological and the psychological. It is also originally dual and controversial as it is a process of transition of an activity "for oneself" to an activity "for another" and "for the others". Pedagogical activity always serves communicative, constructive, gnostic, projective and organizational functions.

It must be noted that despite all the variety of scientific researches devoted to the question of educators, there isn't enough material that would cover the content of pedagogical activity from the point of view of using the language as a cultural measure that forms a society and the most important existential factor that stands as a base for forming a personality.

Let us provide some statements of scholars who share this viewpoint.

Avdeyeva (2016), philosopher (Krasnoyarsk State Medical University named after prof. V. F. Voyno-Yasenetski, Russian Federation) thinks that "the nature of humanitarization of education has an anthropo-lingvo-ontological character where the language and consciousness play a key role in "rooting" of a man into the social existence and social reality as a level of creation. The condition for humanitarizing the system of education is the linguistic realness and linguistic polyphony of subjects of education" (p. 7). The system of education is an auctorial onto-anthropological metatext. In this meaning the system of education is considered to be a unified semantic field which exists in the tension between linguistic poles of subjects of communication (Avdeyeva, 2011).

Asadullin (2013), pedagogue (Bashkir State Pedagogical University named after M. Akmulla, Bashkortostan, Russian Federation) considers that "the notion of a dialogue has an exclusive significance for understanding the meaning of pedagogical activity as there is a wide exchange of connotations and meanings between subjects of the educational process in it and with its involvement. An educator himself must have motifs and abilities of a dialogue participant and use his actions to stimulate those qualities in his students" (p. 95).

Viktorova (2008), pedagogue (Reshetnev Siberian State University of science and technology, Russian Federation) says that one of the means of humanising the educational process and humanitarizing the education is the language as a means of cultural transmission and a condition for creating and saving the cultural elements and transferring them to the future generations... If the education is considered to be the accumulation of experience in the area of culture then cultural inheritance, comprehension and interpretation are impossible without the language as a way of persona's existence (Viktorova, 2008).

Grigorieva-Golubeva (2011), pedagogue (Nevsky Institute of Language and Culture, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation) is sure that "in the whole of humanistic values of pedagogical communication "a teacher who speaks" and his linguistic culture stand out as a complex multidimensional object of study whose individuality is determined by the level of development and unique interrelation between humanistic personal disposition and the combination of linguistic traits" (p. 113).

Kochetkova, Chernenkov, Bugaeva, and Dorogoykin, pedagogue, philologist (Saratov State Medical University named after V. I. Razumovsky, Russian Federation) explain that "good oral speech of an educator is the most important component of his professional characteristic. Expressive speech of a pedagogue in any form of his communication with students helps to create an atmosphere of collective creativity, empathy and mutual understanding. Students find themselves involved in the scientific aesthetics and show indigenous interest to the object of study only when their teacher could step away from the heavy, impassionate language of textbooks and from complex and clichéd constructions typical for written speech" (Kochetkova et al., 2016, p. 84).

Luneva (2017), pedagogue (Samara State Transport University, Russian Federation) believes that

*even with the most intensive introduction of technical means to the educational process the word of an educator still continues to be the most powerful force. In the process of teaching a pedagogue as a communicative leader organizes the information exchange, controls the cognitive and empirical activities and regulates the relations between the students. The word is his main instrument and it must be the touchstone of literacy, a model of high linguistic culture. Teachers must remember that neglecting their linguistic reputation and considering the culture of their speech to be secondary naturally they get “transferred” to the range of incompetent people which means that they do not have an adequate grip of their profession. (pp. 228-229)*

Bondyрева and Murashov (2007), psychologist (Moscow institute of psychological and social studies, Russian federation) supposes that “an educator is a verbal personality; his word is able to change the course of history. An educator is “homo loquens et homo argens”, or a speaking man, a reasoning man, whose verbal behavior is based on creative intentions and verbalization, unique for all the cases of monologues and dialogues. Verbal personality of an educator itself determines its verbal behavior, serving as its active subject” (Bondyрева & Murashov, 2007, p. 215).

Therefore studying linguistic culture of an educator and the development of his linguistic personality as a cultural problem we investigate a subject of educational activity who possesses the sum of qualities allowing him to implement a clearly human activity – to advocate the culture of The Word (mainly oral) by a personal example, at that providing the expressiveness of speech and the thoroughness of communication, and creating the perceptible and emotional texts of culture, that meet the demands of objective content of communication and also allowing to perceive speech. High level of educator’s linguistic culture reflects his individuality or his possibility to participate in objective conceptual interpersonal communication which supposes an understanding of human existence.

The development of rational forms of social organization and rational ways of thinking greatly influenced the linguistic culture of an educator as a carrier of meanings. Nowadays it is conventional among scientists to regard the language as a notion or speakers’ conscience. The language is none other but a creation of notions. Notion is essential for existence of the language. Language exists as a creation of notions, and a language is a creation of knowledge at the same time and because of it (Castillo, 2015). Ways of cognition – the formation of notions – are connected with various ways of thinking, which function in the educational linguistic society where a communicative situation reflects the crisis of communication on the level of “teacher-student” relations.

Linguistic analysis of formal and informal dialogues of the participants of educational process made it possible to conclude that the base of constituting the linguistic space of contemporary school is defined by imperative notions. The dialogue is a “dormant” category. The main means of expressing an order for students to act is the imperative – as a “categorical form of mood which expresses an immediate willingness (a request or a command of the speaker) with the aim to motivate the listener to a certain act” and as a sole form of the verb which performs the appellative function in its direct meaning. Quite often the imperative semantics are complicated with a meaning of obligation which is empowered by corresponding structures like “I demand immediately”, “right away”, “at this instant”, “for up to”, etc. on

the connotative level. Grammatical forms of perfective and imperfective verbs connected with connotative aspect of imperative are often used as well.

As a result of performed observational analysis we can state that educators express various types of stimulation by lexical (verbal) means: most often the meaning of order (51,8%), direct prohibition (13,6%), permit, consent, obligation (7,7%); less often a meaning of a request with different connotations (5,3%); offer (6,9%), advice (3,3%). Potential openness of students for communication with their educators, their aspiration to exchange values collides with a visible tendency of educators to close up upon themselves, get isolated. Interaction becomes formal, the dialogue is only regarded as a formal function, communicative experience is coloured with the dominance of monolog and an authoritarian tone.

Under the conditions of lingvo-cultural polyphony complicated with individual and socio-cultural experience and the means of self-expression of the communicants, “imperative” verbal format of cultural interaction between educators and students does not advance the development of common linguistic field, where the dialogue of ideas could become possible and which supposes not only interpersonal and intercultural communication but also the acceptance of existence as communication alongside ethical imperatives towards the existence of another person. In the educational space of school there is a complex situation when “two monological consciousness try to eliminate each other in the area of potential dialogue” (Kolotaev, 2009; Kolotaev & Ulybina, 2016).

The critics of specific relational principles which can be observed in the linguistic space of a high school attempted by Bondyreva (2011) deserves substantial attention (“principles of relations specific for higher education institutes that provide certain and typical level and character of culture of interaction between carriers and translators of transmitted culture are not implemented or are almost not implemented”). We support Bondyreva’s (2011) opinion according to which “in the modern conditions forming subject-to-subject relations shouldn’t and can’t be performed on the basis of controversy, opposition, tension and dictatorship” (p. 286). An educator should create an empathic communicative atmosphere which minimizes “individual notional texts” preventing mutual understanding (Bondyreva & Murashov, 2007, p. 138).

As a result of our investigation we can state that “non-dialogical” communicative behavior of educators determined by the content of individual linguistic culture is characterized by active and linguistically unjustified “blurring of edges between literary language and its subculture forms, false scientificity, euphemizing uncommon meanings and notions and so on” (Sulimov, 2009, p. 143; Sklyarevskaya, 2001). The conclusion of V. A. Sulimov can be confirmed with the results of our research which made it possible to elicit critically important remarks of students in regard to the quality and content of linguistic culture of educators.

500 respondents took part in the survey (second year university students, school students) where: 94 people (18,8%) are resented by violent individuality of educators who have claimed the right to “the language” or to express their own meanings which creates a controversial interaction between linguistic cultures; 39 people (7,8%) pointed out unjustified use of popular jargonisms and slangy expressions changing common configurations of language area of professional pedagogical activity; 78 people (15,6%) pointed out notional distortion of “alien” concepts (especially by educators of middle age); 123

people (24,6%) mentioned frequent use of negative and offensive words (verbal offense), intensifying the expressiveness and enforcing the measures of psycho-emotional influence on students, at that “sealing” the contact; 37 people (7,4%) pointed out a low level of terminological culture; 126 people (25,2 %) stated “verbal liberation”, which often “shocks” and does not correspond with conventional social concepts about educators; only 3 people (0.6%) confirmed their full satisfaction with communicative interaction with educators.

Observation and further analytical interviewing of educators (with 350 surveyed) made it possible to conclude that the educators themselves aren't that opinionated about their qualitative indicators of linguistic culture and their place in it. Moreover, the educators are disconcerted by the assessment of their communicative behavior given by their students and they tend to believe that the tense linguistic situation is defined by a low level of linguistic culture of the students themselves.

#### **6.4. Research results**

As contextual features, that determine communicative behavior connected with the linguistic culture of the person, within which there is interpersonal communication between subjects of educational process, educators listed the following:

1. “Online interlocutor” appears to be more important than real communication with educators and it causes irritation which gets reflected in the use of specific communicative units (non-sentence statements) destroying dialogical communication” – 47 people (13,4%).

2. “It's difficult to construct the world of real communications and develop spiritual potential of the person under the conditions of dominance of virtual communication which has absorbed modern young people” – 22 people (6,3%).

3. “Communicative potential of students is low that's why to achieve communicative effect one often needs to use the monologue” – 16 people (4,6%).

4. “Verbal development of students isn't adapted for getting involved into dialogical contexts” – 51 person (14,6%).

5. “Notional positions and emotional attitude of students doesn't help to create optimal dialogical tone of communication” – 47 people (13,4%).

6. “It's difficult to control communicative processes of a person who is “plunged” into the informational flux – 23 people (6,6%).

7. “The students reject communicative leadership that's why it's necessary to create an illusion of a dialogue with them” – 19 people (5,4%).

8. “Communicative behavior of students demands the use of verbal sanctions for impolite behavior of a communicant even with the help of unethical verbal acts” – 15 people (4,3%).

9. “The use of social dialect (school jargon and student jargon) in pedagogical interaction is determined by the necessity to expand lexical content of professional language in order to become easier for students' understanding” - 22 people (6,3%).

10. “Students are less willing to listen to teachers that's why it is necessary to correct the situation of mutual understanding and productive communicative interaction with students – 88 people (25,2%).

## 7. Conclusion

Therefore the forming tendencies in the development of modern communicative processes help to change spiritual and moral regulations of human behavior which influences the character of pedagogical activity which according to practicing pedagogues “looks less and less like the flow of all-encompassing mutuality”. The acquired results urge us to reconsider the position of an educator in the space of linguistic culture and transfer this issue from analytic methodology of research to systemic one. The results of the research can be helpful for pedagogues of higher educational institutions, vocational educational institutions, secondary schools.

## References

- Afful, I. (2017). An Ethnography of Communication: Viva Voce in a Ghanaian University. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 5(5), 127-134.
- Asadullin, R. M. (2013). *CHelovek v zerkale obrazovaniya [Man in the mirror of education]*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Avdeyeva, E. A. (2011). Filosofsko-antropologicheskie osnovaniya gumanitarizacii sistemy obrazovaniya [Philosophic and anthropocentric bases of humanitarization of educational system]. *Vestnik Krasnoyarskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im.V. P. Astaf'eva. [Bulletin of Krasnoyarsk State Pedagogical University named after V.P. Astafiyev]*, 4, 186-191.
- Avdeyeva, E. A. (2016). Genezis antropologicheskogo izmereniya sistemy obrazovaniya [The genesis of anthropocentric measurements in the educational systems]. *Alma Mater*, 12, 6-11.
- Benhabib S. (2003). *Prityazaniya kul'tury. Ravenstvo i raznoobrazie v global'nyu eru [Claims of culture. Equality and variety in the global era]*. Moskva: Logos [Moscow: Logos].
- Bondyreva, S. K. (2011). *Psihologo-pedagogicheskie problemy integrirvaniya obrazovatel'nogo prostranstva [Pedagogical and psychological problems of integrating the educational space]*. Moskva: Moskovskij psihologo-social'nyj institut, Voronezh: NPO "MODEK" [Moscow: Moscow psychological and social Institute, Voronezh: NPO "MODEK"].
- Bondyreva, S. K., & Murashov, A. A. (2007). *Kommunikaciya: ot dialoga mezhlichnostnogo k dialogu mezhkul'turnomu [Communication: from a dialogue between persons to a dialogue between cultures]*. Moskva: Moskovskij psihologo-social'nyj institut, Voronezh: NPO "MODEK" [Moscow: Moscow psychological and social Institute, Voronezh: NPO "MODEK"].
- Castillo, J. (2015). Meaning, What is It. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics. Special Issue: Linguistics of Saying*, 3(6-1), 67-76.
- Chaaroui, J. (2017). Pedagogics of learning foreign languages: centrality towards linguistic competence – action and reaction. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 5 (6), 187-200.
- Fortunatova, V. A. (2012). Kul'turnoe modelirovanie literaturnogo teksta [Cultural modeling of literary text]. *Kul'turologicheskij zhurnal [Journal of Cultural Research]*, 2 (8), 1-10. Retrieved from [http://cr-journal.ru/rus/journals/124.html&j\\_id=10](http://cr-journal.ru/rus/journals/124.html&j_id=10)
- Grigorieva-Golubeva, V. A. (2011). *Gumanisticheskie cennosti v obrazovanii i razvitie yazykovoj lichnosti pedagoga. [Humanistic values in education and development of educator's linguistic persona]*. Sankt-Peterburg: GMTU [Saint-Petersburg: GMTU].
- Horuzhaya, S. V. (2012). Smyslovaya sfera kul'tury v kontekste krizisnyh i degradacionnyh processov [Semantic sphere of culture in the context of crisis and degradation processes]. In *Proceedings of Kuban Historical Readings. III All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference*, (pp. 249-254). Krasnodar: CNTI.
- Hrolenko, A. T. (2017). Kakoj viditsya ekologicheskaya filologiya [What is ecological philology?] *Russkaya rech' [Russian Speech]*, 5, 49-56.
- Ivchenkov, V. I. (2012). Krizis rechevoj kul'tury [Crisis of linguistic culture]. In *Materialy XII Mezhdunar. nauch.-prakt. konf "Menedzhment vuzovskih bibliotek. Rol' biblioteki universiteta v formirovanii informacionnoj kul'tury specialista XXI veka" [Proceedings of XII International*

Conference "Management of Universities libraries. Role of Universities libraries in the formation of information culture of the XXI century specialist" (pp. 23-33). Minsk: Publishing House of Belorussia State University.

- Karpukhina, V. N. (2013). *Konstruirovaniye lingvisticheskoy real'nosti pri smene semioticheskogo koda kul'tury [Constructing of linguistic reality within the change of semiotic cultural code]*. Barnaul: AltGU.
- Kirillova, N. B. (2011). Ot mediakul'tury k medialogii [From mediaculture to mediology]. *Kul'turologicheskij zhurnal [Culturological Journal]*, 4(6), 1-15. Retrieved from [http://www.cr-journal.ru/rus/journals/98.html&j\\_id=8](http://www.cr-journal.ru/rus/journals/98.html&j_id=8)
- Kochetkova, T. V., Chernenkov, U. V., Bugaeva, I. O., & Dorogoykin, D. L. (2016). Rechevoe masterstvo pedagoga vysshej shkoly [Verbal mastership of an educator of a higher school]. *Saratovskij nauchno-medicinskij zhurnal [Saratov Scientific and Medical Journal]*, 12(1), 82-86.
- Kolotaev, V. A. (2009). Sub'ekt bez kul'tury na rubezhe vekov [Subject without culture at the turn of the century]. In *Culture on the cusp of XX and XXI centuries: globalization processes* (pp. 538-617). Saint-Petersburg: Nestor-Istoria.
- Kolotaev, V. A., & Ulybina, E. V. (2016). Krizisy identichnosti v situacii neopredelennosti kak varianty odnosheniya k sebe [Identity crises in the situation of uncertainty as variants of attitude towards oneself]. *Mir psihologii. Nauchno-metodicheskij zhurnal [The world of psychology. Scientific and Methodological Journal]*, 3(87), 121-132.
- Lazutkina, E. M. (2017). O razrushenii nacional'nyh yazykov v epohu globalizacii [On the destruction of national languages in global era]. *Trudy Instituta russkogo yazyka im. V. V. Vinogradova. Kul'tura russkoj rechi [Works of the Russian language institute named after V.V. Vinogradov. Culture of Russian speech]*, 13, 268-279.
- Luneva, L. P. (2017). Formirovaniye professional'no-rechevogo imidzha prepodavatelya v usloviyah povysheniya kvalifikacii [Formation of professional and verbal image of an educator under the conditions of further training]. *Izvestiya YUzhnogo federal'nogo universiteta. Filologicheskie nauki [Bulletin of the Southern Federal University. Philological sciences]*, 3, 228-235.
- Novikova, N. L. (2004). *Kul'tura povsednevnosti [Culture of everyday life]*. Saransk: Krasnyj Oktyabr' [Saransk: Red October].
- Opina, K. G. (2017). Behavior of verbal communication: how students of male and female sexes interact in gender discussions. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 5(5), 135-142.
- Savrutskaya, E. P. (2004). Fenomen kommunikacii v sovremennom mire [Phenomenon of communication in the modern world]. In *Aktual'nye problemy teorii kommunikacii [Urgent problems of communication theory]* (pp. 75-85). Saint-Petersburg: Publishing House of Saint-Petersburg State Pedagogical University.
- Savrutskaya, E. P. (2008). Filosofskij vzglyad na problemy kommunikacii v sovremennom mire [Philosophic review of the issues of communication in the modern world]. *Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo gos. lingvisticheskogo universiteta im. N. A. Dobrolyubova. Lingvistika i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikaciya [Bulletin of the Linguistics University of Nizhny Novgorod. Linguistics and Intercultural Communication]*, 2, 140-151.
- Savrutskaya, E. P. (2012). Kommunikacionnyj aspekt innovacionnyh transformacij v konstruirovanii social'noj real'nosti [Communicative aspect of innovative transformation in the construction of social reality]. *Kul'turologicheskij zhurnal [Culturological Journal]*, 3(9), 127-134.
- Sklyarevskaya, G. N. (2001). Slovo v menyayushchemsya mire: russkij yazyk nachala XXI stoletiya: sostoyaniye, problemy, perspektivy mezhkul'turnaya kommunikaciya [The word in the changing world: The Russian language of the early XXI century: state, problems, perspectives]. *Issledovaniya po slavyanskim yazykam [The Slavic Languages Researches]*, 6, 177-202.
- Sulimov, V. A. (2009). Konceptsiya sovremennogo literaturnogo teksta: kul'turologiya i kognitivistika [The concept of modern literary text: culturology and cognitive sciences]. *Vestnik Severnogo (Arkticheskogo) federal'nogo universiteta. Gumanitarnye i social'nye nauki [Bulletin of the Northern (Arctic) Federal University. Humanitarian and social sciences]*, 2, 142-146.
- Toffler, E. (2008). *Shok budushchego [Shock of the future]*. Moscow: AST.

- Viktorova, L. G. (2008). YAzykovaya lichnost' i kul'turnaya funkciya vysshej shkoly [Linguistic persona and cultural function of higher education]. In: *Materialy vserossijskoj konferencii "Rol' yazyka v formirovanii sociokul'turnoj lichnosti specialista v sovremennyh usloviyah"* [Proceedings of All-Russian Conference "The role of language in the formation of socio-cultural persona of a specialist in modern conditions"], (pp. 8-10). Krasnoyarsk: SibSTU.
- Whorf, B. (2003). Otnoshenie norm povedeniya i myshleniya k yazyku [The relation of behavioral norms and thinking to the language]. In *Yazyki kak obraz mira* [Languages as the image of the world] (pp. 157-202). Saint-Petersburg: Terra Fantastica.