

Dialogic Pedagogy in Teaching the Disciplines in the Higher Education System

Elena Smirnova and Valerij Georgiadi

Department of Engineering Ecology and Municipal Facilities,
St. Petersburg State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering,
Vtoraja Krasnoarmejskaja ul. 4, St. Petersburg, 190005, Russia

Submitted: Jul 30, 2013; **Accepted:** Aug 29, 2013; **Published:** Aug 29, 2013

Abstract: A systematic model of education is based on the fact that education is closely linked to socio-economic development of the country. Programs providing basic education are a fundamental tool in the behavior changes in social and cultural areas of the country on its way to the ideal of a modern post-industrial development. Many teachers in Russia, as in Europe and America, have abandoned the old “banking” approach to education, providing for the primary (centering) role of the teacher in the educational process and began to follow the principles of “pedagogy of cooperation”, which is based on a dialogue, as the most optimal form of pedagogical communication between teacher and students. The new pedagogical paradigm is not about moving from the instructional (“centering” and “closed”), person-alienated and unidirectional model of learning, in which the teacher produces only enforceable regulatory content to all students without regard to their personality and cognitive abilities, to the dialogue (“decentering” and “open”), personality-oriented model, where the content of teaching the students is formed by their direct and active participation and interaction with the teacher. Only in this case a situation of cooperation, a possibility of dialogue (decentering practice) emerges. The creative capacity of language to generate meanings can be activated in the dialogue process only, providing a surge of increasing meanings in the applied use, making the process of self-generation of meaning open, which cannot be done through traditional forms of pedagogy.

Key words: Monological model of teaching • Dialogue • Personality • Outlook • Decentering dialogic model of pedagogy

INTRODUCTION

The intensively developing technology needs are rapidly changing the nature of engineering education. Not the individual engineers, “closed” in the traditional engineering disciplines, but multi-disciplinary teams of professionals with a wide intellectual range, possessing core competencies at the world level, set the pace in the industry. The interdisciplinary character of high technologies that solve complex problems in both traditional and new areas requires actualization of new paradigms in educational activity - a dialogic model of teaching.

On the other hand, a real integration of science, technology and advanced industrial technologies in Russian universities is the “spirit” of our time, so the

content of courses and workshops should be driven to an appropriate form of innovative engineering education. International quality requirements for the training of a professional engineer are the basis for the design of training programs for Bachelors and Masters in St. Petersburg State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering. Dialogic model of pedagogy contributes directly to the implementation of the principles of grade-rating system and contributes to adaptation of technologies and students teaching systems to the new international parameters.

The increasing relevance of the scientific-technological revolution in higher education related to the gradual reduction of class-lesson teaching and the growing importance of training, based on the use of task- and project-oriented experience as the primary

method for effective training for professional activity requires a change and abandonment of monocentric pedagogical approaches, which is spoken by many professionals-innovators not only in Russia, but also in the West [1-7].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Criteria of the ABET and the Bologna Declaration for registration as an international professional engineer are used.

The study of the innovation process in the field of pedagogy in the system of higher education requires the use of the following methodological classification:

- Model of dialogue in education;
- Dialogue as a form of co-creativity of teachers and students;
- Knowledge is actively constructed by the cognizer and not acquired by a purely informative, passive way;
- Knowledge is not a “clean slate” (tabula rasa), which reflects the cognizable world, but is used to organize and structure the previously acquired experience;
- Education is the ability to understand the other.

The Main Part: As a result of training, graduates should acquire the ability (we use the ABET criteria as one of the most respected organizations in the world, dealing with evaluation of educational programs in engineering and technology):

- To apply the scientific, mathematical and engineering knowledge;
- To plan and conduct an experiment, analyze and interpret data;
- To design systems, their components or processes in accordance with the tasks;
- To work in teams on interdisciplinary topics;
- To formulate and solve engineering problems;
- To be aware of professional and ethical responsibilities;
- To communicate effectively;
- To demonstrate erudition, required for understanding global and social impact of engineering solutions;
- To understand the need for and be able to learn all the time;
- To demonstrate knowledge of contemporary issues;
- To apply the skills and modern engineering techniques required for engineering [8].

Generally, these requirements to educational standard comply with the rules of the Bologna Declaration, which proclaimed transition to the innovative engineering education, science-intensive engineering and creating an indissoluble chain “engineering education – science – economy”. The Bologna process involves the creation of a uniform quality assessment system, accreditation of educational programs and specialists certification, namely:

- Introduction of comprehensible, comparable qualifications in higher education.
- Transition to the two-stage system of higher education (bachelor-master).
- Introduction of estimates of labor input (courses, programs, academic load) in terms of credits and reflection of the curriculum in the annex to the diploma, a sample of which is designed by UNESCO.
- Increasing the mobility of students, teachers and administrative staff.
- Providing the required quality of higher education, mutual recognition of qualifications and relevant documents in the field of higher education.
- Ensuring the independence of universities [9-10].

The above requirements for high-quality professional engineering must be oriented in such pedagogical approaches that make assimilation of knowledge by the students will take place in the best way. They cannot be implemented via conservative teaching methods that have become traditional, which, for example, are described by a Canadian expert on pedagogy M. Gilling:

- Knowledge is acquired systematically to acquire the bundle of knowledge;
- School is the main place of knowledge transfer in various areas;
- Memorization is the main process in learning;
- Basic educational values are memory, understanding, a desire to know, respect for authority;
- Necessary and useful knowledge is in training programs;
- Logic of education is identical to the logic of training;
- Knowledge is pre-arranged by the teacher [11].

In many ways, these methods are inconclusive [12-14]. In the innovation educational process the teacher needs to reject the monopoly on power and build relations with students in the outline of equal partnership in communication [15-16]. Inasmuch as in dialogue both parties study, both parties ask questions, both reflect and

both are involved in meanings creation, insofar the teacher needs to facilitate communication between the students and the exchange of views [17]. The case is about the definite pedagogical content of dialogue, due to which the teacher sets the semantic orientation of communication, so to speak, confronts the students with “the problem of the meaning” and thus creates a situation of generation of new knowledge [18].

But how can it be done, if communication itself is based on language, symbolizing any form of coercive power. In the words of Roland Barthes, the language, due to its very structure, contains the inherent fatal attitude of alienation. Talking, or much less arguing, does not mean to engage in communicative act, as it can often be heard. The whole language is an entirely universally valid form of coercion. This is a means to subjugate the listener. According to Barthes, in each sign sleeps that monster: a stereotype (En chaque signe dort ce monstre: un stéréotype) [19, p. 504]. Thus, at the level of methodological reflection, being within the paradigm of classical rationality, we feel the pressure of traditional norms that we ourselves have proposed and enshrined in the language. We find ourselves in the situation of hostages of stereotypical approaches in education.

However, we are not satisfied by repeating what has already been said. The situation in the language is such that a variety of points of view on ways of designation, the diversity of the subject matters themselves, combined with of the multiplicity of mechanisms of their understanding make the number of these points of view uncertain. In this case a dialogic approach for the implementation of the meaning-generating vector in training is required, because the dialogue is primarily understanding, acceptance of ambiguity of meaning [20]. Only the dialogic approach is the assumption of participation and acceptance of another’s words, i.e. it can seriously approach it as a semantic position as to the other point of view. Only with the internal dialogic assumption my word is in close connection with another person’s word, but at the same time it does not merge with it and does not absorb it [21].

Personality is not something that begins in the heart of the individual and is issued to the periphery for the perception of other people. Personality arises at the periphery of the individual, in the existential, rather than cognitive (!) communication with other individuals. I am aware of myself and become myself, only revealing myself to another person, through another person and with the help of another person. The very being of man is the deepest communion. According to the existential

assumption of Mikhail Bakhtin, to be means to communicate. To be means to be for another and through the other, for oneself. “A person has no internal sovereign territory, he is wholly and always on the boundary; looking inside himself, he looks into the eyes of another or with the eyes of another” [22, p. 287].

Not only a group, but the entire human community can be considered polyphonic, because each person has his own unique outlook, which should be taken into account through dialogic interaction [23]. Thus there is an infinite penetration of one person into the other and each personality is formed as a common ideological foundation of the communicating group, so that no participant in the dialogue can determine the amount of their contribution to the foundation. None of the participants in the dialogue can claim a monopoly of their world view and thus of the truth. The dialogue develops a special semantic landscape, polyphonic choir, in which none of the parties can claim even the knowledge of themselves [24].

According to Ernst von Glasersfeld, knowledge is designing. It does not correspond to the objective world, but is suitable for living in it. The world, in which we live, is such as it is and it cannot be any other, because it is us who create and design it [15].

In this case, the educational process becomes a research program that aims to clarify how the mind can construct a more or less reliable, regular world from the empirical flow, as a result of its activity [25]. But it is possible, if we feel equal another person’s consciousness beside us and before us, endless and infinite like ours, designing and recreating not the world of objects, but these other people’s consciousnesses with their own worlds. But other people’s consciousnesses cannot be analyzed as things. You can only communicate with them dialogically, talk to them. Von Glasersfeld’s viewpoint is the inability to go beyond our own experience of speaking: we need not the abandonment of ourselves and our minds, but the extraordinary extension and alteration of consciousness in a certain direction so that it could fit the full-fledged other people’s consciousnesses [26].

According to Paulo Freire, the process of understanding our place in the world should begin with the capabilities of critical symbolization, that is, analysis of the process itself. Since the moment of awareness of the inadequacy of discourse we should inspire the learning process, the first task of which is to give birth to the realization that the above discourse is not the only one. After that it is necessary to create the conditions for actions, as it is impossible to act disorderly. Thus, we need to structure the group, to explore the individual

necessary qualities and understand which of them are really urgent and which can be solved collectively. Finally, find strategies for dealing with emerging obstacles. This study of the group necessities (including us as part of these groups) relies primarily on listening dialogue, through which the diversity of experience in the process of building and exchange of knowledge is always taken into account. The teacher takes into account and uses the flexibility in the learning process of thinking and introduces students to the idea that “naming things and doing the job can be done in different ways” [27].

Its activity is aimed at developing tolerance for diversity of opinion. The point is not that the truth of subject matters should always be disclosed only in the excessive teaching horizon. When the teacher suggests in advance that the student cannot see or understand anything unembraceable to their minds, no dialogue with the students can occur. Here we have the external position that does not involve and does not account for a possible response from the students themselves: they don't have the last word. In fact, the point of view of the teacher should meet with the point of view of the students in the same plane, at the same level [20]. Open and closed questions, analysis and synthesis, etc contribute to the development of a dialogue. The emerging positive feedback allows the following:

- Forming search activity and motivation of each student;
- Developing the responsibility for the presence of a “counterpoint” in communication, a convergence point of all possible positions and meanings;
- Developing reflexive processes that lead to the student's word in the same plane with a teacher's position and thereby engaging in dialogic relations;
- Exploring those inherent limitations of the student, their quests and controversies giving rise to the points of contradiction and resistance and turning them into development points (the points of dialogic contact);
- Restructuring the monological knowledge, transforming and developing it in a personal dialogical experience of each student.

In practice, this means that the student learns to take responsibility for the process of their education, that is, they learn not only set their own goals and make decisions, but also acquire skills not to have the last word, to reflect the dialogic nature of the human mind in their outlook. Thus, the teacher continuously connects the personal meanings of a student, including their life

crises, with the knowledge of the dispute, in which all possible consciousness and positions are allowed. Due to that the developing dialogue repeatedly creates points coming into a dialogic contact with everything essential and necessary for the education and culture and not simply putting forward and meeting the innovation needs. Consequently the gap between motivation and the educational process of students is bridged: each another person's “truth” represented in any textbook or instruction, in the words of the teacher or their fellow students enters a dialogic outlook of all class members [21].

We will briefly describe the structure of the dialogic interaction “teacher-student” consisting of the following specific actions of the teacher:

- Entering a dialogic contact with the student (in the case of the group – with everyone personally), allowing “someone else's” truth and question-answer resistance;
- Rejecting the expectations, that is, their own egocentric monological position, forcing one redundant outlook as the ultimate knowledge with respect to each of the students;
- Creating an agreement on the terms of joint activity – empowering the students with the right to know and understand each other's “truth”;
- Transferring the responsibility for the learning process to the students (while avoiding the complete object dialogue or a dialogue played out rhetorically);
- Initiating the dialogic experiences and needs of students (they “don't need millions, they just need to get a thought straight”, let us remember Dostoevsky);
- Researching the points of conflict and turning them into points of development to bring the dialogue of the “opposing truths”;
- Exposing and restructuring of the shared knowledge when all the teaching material and the “points of view” of the students are involved in the dialogue, when the students answer the teacher's questions, ask new questions, provoke him, argue with him or confirm his thoughts.

This structure of dialogic interaction is aimed at the following:

- Guaranteeing the rights of the student for question-response resistance, including non-response or acknowledgment in incapacity to engage in the class (any “truth” should be acceptable);

- Reliance on the real needs of the student in the dialogue (based on the fact that human consciousness in itself is dialogic);
- Activating the search activity/motivation of the student through dialogue;
- Activating the reflective processes of the student on the basis of self-awareness that exceptionally increases the direct semantic importance of self-utterance, increases its internal resistance to any external knowledge completion through the monological assumption;
- Motivating the student to create new cognitive structures and, thus, to expand the ideological values of the specialty that they study;
- Including into this evaluation of the specialty the idea of dialogue and incompleteness as the constituent elements of continuous education in the ever-changing world;
- Transferring the responsibility to the students for their spiritual life, in other words, other thoughts and ideas - bad or indifferent from their monological viewpoint, alien to their world view, should gain acceptance, be not polemically denied and lose their direct significance (“tertium non datur”) but get the status of full-fledged ideas, with which they will have to argue and engage in dialogue.

We can call the above functions the first order functions, as in their unity they generate a second order function:

- Overcoming the monological powerlessness (cognitive, learned, social), based on self-centeredness;
- Bridging the gap between motivation and activities (negated alien thought does not gap the monological outlook of the student, on the contrary, they withdraw into their borders even more sharply and more persistently);
- Preventing or overcoming dependency and antisocial behavior.

Second order functions give rise to the functions of the following order – the third. This includes socio-dialogic rehabilitation of the students, allowing them to create a rightful consciousness of others next to their own, as the process and the result of the dialogic interaction [21].

How do we ensure the readiness of students to conduct classes in dialogic form, if the essence of the educational process is not in the championship of the ideological assumption of the teacher and not in the fact that he is able to get them to accept new knowledge?

The study of any module in an engineering specialty is based on the development of critical thinking of students. It leads to the birth of new knowledge, a deeper understanding of the problem. Application of a dialogic learning in this case is based on the fact that both teachers and students in the class are in constant search of new knowledge and the new knowledge cannot be just transferred to the students, but instead they emerge in the situation of manifestation and mastering their ability of ultimate selflessness [28].

We would illustrate this assumption with an example. Students know the contents of various laws, documents, technical regulations, building codes, codes of practice. They can answer the questions of SNIP-2-11-77 or SNIP-2-10-74. They know the main sections of these documents. There is only one problem: they have never read them. All this knowledge has been gleaned from the textbook and from the teacher; knowing the documents, he explained to students how and what is calculated. When, instead of a textbook, the students have to study documents SNIP-2-11-77 and SNIP-2-10-74, they have to acquire new skills: read the text independently and form their own opinions about it. But what happens, if the student does not read specific texts so necessary for their education?

According to the French philosopher Roland Barthes, the issue should be put in a different perspective. “Every text is eternally written here and now” (Tout texte est écrit éternellement ici et maintenant) [29, p. 43]. The whole world, the whole culture is presented as text, hypertext, in which single texts of the preceding and contemporary culture operate. The texts are endowed with a special property – intertextuality – the ability to refer to each other in a variety of quotations, allusions, references, etc. Thus, each new text includes citations of previous texts, the new text is written on top of the old one and is woven into a common hypertext. The universal polyphony of texts, ideas emerges, the essence of which lies in the cultivation of thinking people. In light of this dialogic paradigm, the work of the future expert engineer is potentially dialogic: he possesses a kind of “knowledge”, from which he consciously or unconsciously derives quotes, mixes them, combines with an internal dispute

with himself and creates his own opinion. The intertext (in this case this is everything a teacher shall use for the study of special texts) is a “convergence space” of all possible citations – individual phrases, paragraphs, passages in various books and sources. The whole culture of education consists of citations and every student is immersed in this atmosphere like it or not. Thus, even if they have never read any SNIP in their life, they are still surrounded by various inherently dialogic discourses (scientific, ideological, etc.), under the influence of which their texts are created – their primary knowledge about SNIP – the intersection of various discourses, cultural meanings and types of writing. Their education is not about reading one or more documents (and thus understand how they can be included in a special relation to the economy, requiring more and more innovations), but about unraveling the complex “tangle” of citations; detecting more and more new meanings (activating awareness of their own ignorance due to laziness), for every reading and participating in the lesson involves the discovery of new meanings and hence the activation of selflessness as a basic capacity for intellectual development.

The teacher must agree that the student will receive the credit without reading SNIP, for critical thinking can only be critical when there is any possibility of reading any literature on specific issues. This is the individual nature of modern education, which declares that students must have enough freedom to use their own heads and think independently to solve the most complex questions.

According to the American philosopher and educator John Dewey, only trying to find their own way out of a difficult situation, the student really learns to think and constitutes the capacity for selflessness, without which the constant promotion of innovative technologies and innovation is not possible [30]. Critical thinking of students is not required to be completely original: they have the right to take an idea or creeds of the other person as their own. Consequently, the complexity of teaching critical thinking and dialogic thinking is to help students see the infinite variety of problems (citations) around us, other consciousnesses and truths. The important thing is that everyone decides for themselves what and how they will read, to eventually gain independence - the most important feature of critical thinking [31, p. 41]. Of course, this does not negate the fact that students must not only know, but should be able to solve problems by using the methods of their profession.

Thus, education, or the formation of the image of a person is much more than just drilling the students to

make them competent in the SNIP or other special documents. Education is not just a bank of accumulated knowledge to reproduce and broadcast the existing patterns of knowledge. In the course of a true learning an individual has to exert an effort to force through to their meaning, to their expression; to experience and construct new knowledge through dialogic skill, achieving semantic completeness through selflessness.

CONCLUSIONS

The participants of the educational process are, first of all, the participants in the dialogue. They should have the ability to reflect and self-criticize in regard to their own reasoning, because the dialog allows both teachers and students to become co-investigators, in other words, the teaching attitude should meet the internal dialogic resistance from students. The teacher delegates the responsibility, “the final word” to the students. He provides students with the freedom of choice and does not impose a comprehensive and all-knowing vision, in which everything has been seen, shown and suggested in the last instance. Building a learning process as a responsible attitude to their own experience, the teacher provides an informed and flexible division of responsibilities between themselves and the students during the learning process. The teacher’s outlook must dialogically intersect and collide with the students’ outlook, his word should feel the resistance of their possible word, which in its own way (even illiterate and without proper scientific credibility), from the point of view of their truth, would have covered the same subject. Only in this case there is a situation of cooperation, the possibility of dialogue (decentering practice), where each element is related to something other than itself, keeps the echo generated by the sound of the preceding element and at the same time is destroyed by the vibration of its own relation to the future element [32, p. 13].

Thus, the dialogic interaction helps achieve the following objectives, namely:

- Promotes overcoming the egocentric monological position of the teacher in respect of themselves and students (students are only entitled to mistakes and ignorance);
- Activates search activity, research position and creative approach, assuming the unity of other people’s consciousnesses (the very concept of a single truth does not imply a need for a unified consciousness of the teacher);

- Restructures the reflexive processes of a teacher (creativity is being thought and perceived as the expression of a dialogue of a number of individual consciousnesses dialogue, not a monological carrier of knowledge);
- Creates new cognitive structures and alters the philosophical significance of the specialties of the institution (first of all, not just one teacher is a knowing, understanding, seeing person, but all those who aspire to absolute selflessness and “think and seek higher things” [33]).

REFERENCES

1. Glaserfeld, E. von, 1997. *Wege des Wissens. Konstruktivistische Erkundungen durch unser Denken* [Ways of knowing: constructivist exploration through our thinking]. Heidelberg, DU: Carl-Auer-Systeme, pp: 263.
2. Glaserfeld, E. von, 1991. A Constructivist's view of learning and teaching. In: *Research in Physics Learning: Theoretical issues and empirical studies* (Ser.: Institut für die Pädagogik der Naturwissenschaften, 131). Proceedings of an International workshop held at the University of Bremen, March 4-8, 1991. Eds. by R. Duit, F. Goldberg and H. Niedderer. Kiel, DU: IPN, pp: 29-39.
3. Grégoire, J., 2011. Une ou plusieurs intelligences. In: *Apprendre et faire apprendre* [One or more intelligences. In: Learning and to learn] (Collection “Apprendre”). Ed. E. Bourgeois et G. Chapelle. Paris, FR: Presses univ. de France - PUF, pp: 69-82.
4. Banathy, B. and P.M. Jenlink, 2005. Dialogue as a means of collective communication. New York, US: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, pp: 440.
5. Rath, A., 2010. The Meno paradox of teaching reflection in teacher education. The purposes, practices and professionalism of teacher reflectivity: Insights for twenty-first-century teachers and students. Ed. by E.G. Pultorak. Lanham, US: Rowman and Littlefield Education, pp: 403-423.
6. Jonnaert, P., J. Barrette, S. Boufrahi and D. Masciotra, 2004. Contribution critique au développement des programmes d'études: compétences, constructivisme et interdisciplinarité [Critical contribution to the development of study programs: Skills, constructivism and interdisciplinarity]. *Revue des sciences de l'éducation* [Journal of Science Education], 30(3): 667-696.
7. Ellinor, L. and G. Gerard, 1998. *Dialogue: Rediscover the transforming power of conversation*. New York, US: John Wiley & Sons, pp: 366.
8. Criteria for accrediting applied science programs. Applied Science Accreditation Commission (ASAC), 2012. Baltimore, US: Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, pp: 12.
9. The Bologna Declaration of 19 June 1999. Date views 21.08.2013 http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/bologna_declaration.pdf.
10. Reichert, S. and C.H. Tauch, 2003. Progress towards the European higher education area. Bologna four years after: Steps toward sustainable reform of higher education in Europe. A report prepared for the European University Association. Date views 21.08.2013 <http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/Trends2003final.1065011164859.pdf>.
11. Gigling, M., 2001. La structure des représentations socioprofessionnelles de futurs enseignants du secondaire à travers différentes conceptions de l'enseignement. In: *Les représentations sociales: Des méthodes de recherche aux problèmes de société* (Collection “Théories et pratiques dans l'enseignement”) [The structure of social and professional representations of future secondary teachers through different conceptions of teaching. In: Social representations: Research methods in social problems]. Ed. M. Lebrun. Outremont, Québec, CA: Les Éditions Logiques, pp: 69-91.
12. Bohm, D., 2003. Dialogue as a new creative order (1987). In: *The Essential David Bohm*. Ed. by L. Nichol. London, New York: Routledge, pp: 289-300.
13. O'Callaghan, P., 2010. Monologism and dialogism in private law. *The Journal Jurisprudence*, 7: 405-440.
14. Crowell, S.G., 1990. Dialogue and text: Re-marking the difference. *The Interpretation of dialogue* (Chicago Studies in Ethnomusicology Series). Ed. by T. Maranhão. Chicago, US: University of Chicago Press, pp: 338-360.
15. Glaserfeld, E. von, 2011. Radikaler Konstruktivismus: Ideen, Ergebnisse, Probleme. [Radical constructivism: Ideas, results, problems] (Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch. Wissenschaft, 1326). Frankfurt am Main, DU: Suhrkamp, pp: 375.
16. Rusch, G. (hrsg.), 1999. Wissen und Wirklichkeit. Beiträge zum Konstruktivismus: Eine Hommage an Ernst von Glasersfeld [Knowledge and reality: Contributions to constructivism] (Ser.: Reihe Konstruktivismus und Systemisches Denken) Heidelberg, DU: Carl-Auer-Systeme, pp: 265).

17. Hatala [Wlodarsky], R.L., 2003. Understanding the relationship between undergraduate college of education professors' beliefs about student learning and teaching and their classroom practices. Dissertation. Cleveland, US: Cleveland State University.
18. Carignan, N., 2007. Mathematics teacher's knowledge and professional development in the context of multi- and intercultural education. In: *Epi-steme 2. International conference to review research on Science, Technology and Mathematics Education. Conference proceedings.* Eds. by C. Natarajan and B. Choksi. Mumbai, IN: Macmillan, pp: 3-11.
19. Barthes, R., 2002. Leçon [Inaugural Lecture, Collège de France]. In: Roland Barthes. *Oeuvres complètes. 5: (1977-1980).* Nouvelle édition revue, corrigée et présentée par Éric Marty. Paris, FR: Éd. du Seuil, pp: 501-521.
20. Georgiadi, V.V., 2010. Dialog teaching in the educational programs of higher education as a way to improve students' independent work. In: *Proceedings of the 67th scientific conference of professors, teachers, scientists, engineers and graduate students. Part 3.* Saint Petersburg, RU, State Architect. Civ. Engin. Univ. Press, pp: 22-28.
21. Smirnova, E.E., 2006. On the problems of teaching the subject "Environmental Economics". *Proceedings of the International scientific-practical conference "Communication technology in the modern world".* Saint Petersburg, RU, Higher School of Economics Publishing, pp: 62-64.
22. Bakhtin, M.M., 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics (Ser.: Theory and History of Literature, vol. 8).* Ed. and transl. by C. Emerson. Introduction by W.C. Booth. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, pp: 332.
23. Townsend, A., 2003. *Autonomous voices: An Exploration of polyphony in the novels of Samuel Richardson,* Oxford, New York: Peter Lang, pp: 236.
24. Thorn, Ju., 1996. *The Lived horizon of my being: The Substantiation of the self & the discourse of resistance in Rigoberta Menchú, MM Bakhtin and Víctor Montejo (Special studies / Center for Latin American Studies, no. 29).* Tempe, US: Arizona State University Press, pp: 136.
25. Glasersfeld, E. von, 1990. An Exposition of constructivism: Why some like it radical. In: *Constructivist views on the teaching and learning of mathematics (Monographs of the Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, vol. 4).* Eds. by R.B. Davis, C.A. Maher and N. Noddings. Reston, US: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, pp: 19-29.
26. Glasersfeld, E. von, 1984. An Introduction to radical constructivism. *The Invented reality: How do we know what we believe we know? Contributions to constructivism.* Ed. by P. Watzlawick. New York, US: W. W. Norton, Incorporated, pp: 17-40.
27. Freire, P., 2004. *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the oppressed.* With notes by Ana Maria Araújo Freire. Transl. by R.R. Barr. London, New York: Continuum, pp: 215.
28. Kazepides, A.C., 2010. *Education as dialogue: Its prerequisites and its enemies.* Montréal, CA: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp: 207.
29. Barthes, R., 2002. La mort de l'auteur [The Death of the author]. In: Roland Barthes. *Oeuvres complètes. 3: (1968-1971).* Nouvelle édition revue, corrigée et présentée par Éric Marty. Paris, FR: Éd. du Seuil, pp: 40-46.
30. Kliebard, H.M., 2006. Dewey's reconstruction of the curriculum: From occupations to disciplined knowledge. In *John Dewey and Our Educational Prospect: A Critical engagement with Dewey's democracy and education,* Ed. by D.T. Hansen. Albany, US: SUNY Press, pp: 113-127.
31. Cunningham, C.A., 2009. Transforming schooling through technology: Twenty-first-century approaches to participatory learning. In: *John Dewey at 150: Reflections for a new century.* Eds. A. G. Rud, J.W. Garrison and L. Stone. West Lafayette, US: Purdue University Press, pp: 40-49.
32. Derrida, J., 2003. *Marges de la philosophie [Margins: Of Philosophy]. (Collection "Critique").* Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, pp: 396.
33. Akathist to the Transfiguration of the Lord. In: *Book of Akathists. Vol. 1: Akathist hymns to the Lord Jesus Christ.* Transl. by I.E. Lambertson. Jordanville, US: Holy Trinity Monastery, pp: 398.