Н. Б. Трофимова, Г. С. Степанова, А. М. Жукова, Е. С. Гончаренко

Влияние поликультурной образовательной среды на формирование нравственной позиции студентов

Введение. Современная образовательная среда в вузах (в том числе и педагогических) носит как моно- так и поликультурный характер, который предполагает осмысление студентами единства и многообразия культур. Одним из условий формирования нравственной позиции личности как показателя духовно-нравственного развития студентов – будущих педагогов выступает поликультурная среда вуза.

Цель статьи – изучить влияние поликультурной среды на формирование нравственной позиции студентов в условиях межкультурного взаимодействия.

Материалы и методы. В исследовании приняли участие две группы студентов Воронежского государственного педагогического университета ($N = 95$), находящихся в моно- и поликультурной средах. Был применен комплекс методик: опросник «Диагностика доброжелательности» (по шкале Кемпбелла); ценностный опросник Ш. Шварца; методика «Диагностика социально-психологических установок личности в мотивационной сфере» О.Ф. Потемкиной; методика «Шкала эмоционального отклика» А. Меграбяна и Н. Эпштейна; методика И.Г. Тимощука «Опросник ДУМЭОЛП – диагностика уровня морально-этической ответственности личности». Статистические методы: непараметрический критерий U-Манна-Уитни.

Результаты. Показано, что студенты, обучающиеся в поликультурной среде, имеют более развитые показатели нравственной позиции, такие как эмоциональный отклик ($U = 74,88$, $p \leq 0,01$), уровень доброжелательности ($U = 5,82$, $p \leq 0,05$), ценность универсализма ($U = 4,46$, $p \leq 0,01$), а также менее выраженную направленность на эгоизм ($U = 3,24$, $p \leq 0,01$). Организация общения и особенности предъявления учебной информации определяют уровень межкультурного диалога и формирование более выраженных показателей нравственной позиции.

Заключение. В соответствии с полученными результатами предлагается создание программы психолого-педагогического сопровождения по формированию нравственной позиции студентов в поликультурной среде вуза.

Ключевые слова: духовно-нравственное развитие, нравственная позиция, поликультурная среда, межкультурный диалог

Ссылка для цитирования:

Трофимова Н. Б., Степанова Г. С., Жукова А. М., Гончаренко Е. С. Влияние поликультурной образовательной среды на формирование нравственной позиции студентов // Перспективы науки и образования. 2021. № 2 (50). С. 365-377. doi: 10.32744/pse.2021.2.25

N. B. TROFIMOVA, G. S. STEPANOVA, A. M. ZHUKOVA, E. S. GONCHARENKO

The influence of the multicultural educational environment on the formation of students' moral position

Introduction. The modern educational environment in universities (including pedagogical ones) is both mono- and multicultural in nature, which involves students' understanding of the unity and diversity of cultures. One of the conditions for the formation of individual moral position as an indicator of the spiritual-moral development of students – future teachers is the multicultural environment of a university.

The purpose of the article is to study the influence of the multicultural environment on the formation of students' moral position in the context of intercultural interaction.

Materials and methods. The study involved two groups of students of the Voronezh State Pedagogical University (N = 95) in mono- and multicultural environments. A set of methods was used: "Diagnostics of Benevolence" questionnaire (according to the Campbell scale); value questionnaire by Schwartz; "Diagnostics of Individual Socio-Psychological Attitudes in the Motivational Sphere" by Potemkina; "Scale of Emotional Response" by Mehrabian and Epstein; "Questionnaire DUMEOLP – Diagnostics of the Level of Moral and Ethical Responsibility of the Personality" by Tymoshchuk. A statistical method – a nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test – was also used.

Results. It was shown that students studying in a multicultural environment have more developed indicators of moral position, such as emotional response ($U = 74.88, p \leq 0.01$), the level of benevolence ($U = 5.82, p \leq 0.05$), the value of universalism ($U = 4.46, p \leq 0.01$), as well as a less pronounced focus on selfishness ($U = 3.24, p \leq 0.01$). The organization of communication and the peculiarities of presenting educational information determine the level of intercultural dialogue and the formation of more pronounced indicators of moral position.

Conclusion. In accordance with the results obtained, it is proposed to create a program of psychological-pedagogical support for the formation of students' moral position in the multicultural environment of a university.

Keywords: spiritual and moral development, moral position, multicultural environment, intercultural dialogue

For Reference:

Trofimova, N. B., Stepanova, G. S., Zhukova, A. M., & Goncharenko, E. S. The influence of the multicultural educational environment on the formation of students' moral position. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovania – Perspectives of Science and Education*, 50 (2), 365-377. doi: 10.32744/pse.2021.2.25

Introduction

The cultural, economic, political, spiritual transformations of our society at the turn of the century have brought about profound changes in the psychology, value orientations and actions of citizens. The social transformations that led to qualitative shifts in the structure of the values of Russians did not pass over young people, including the most receptive to social changes, its dynamic part being students. The study of value orientations, life priorities of modern students is relevant, as it makes it possible to find out the degree of its adaptation to new social conditions and innovative behavioral potential.

Youth is a specific subject of social activity, not only due to age characteristics, increased emotionality and gullibility, but also due to constantly changing conditions of socialization. Revaluation of values, which is inevitable in a transitive stage of development of society, is most manifested in the consciousness of this social group. The future state of society largely depends on what value foundation will be formed among the young generation.

The spiritual and moral development of society, especially the young generation, is a separate problem today [1]. At the same time, the erosion of the concepts of "spirituality" and "morality" recently, the prevalence of their dogmatic declaration reinforces the problem. M.I. Volovikova notes that "... moral issues are crucial in the life of society and in the life of each individual. Only a certain degree of preservation of moral principles allows preserving the country, family and educating the younger generation" [2].

"The concept of spiritual and moral education", formulated in 2009, proclaimed the basic content of socialization of the individual basic national values, which are revealed, in particular, in the ideas of patriotism, social solidarity, citizenship, family, creativity, tolerance, collegiality [3]. The most important prerequisite for the formulation of the Concept is considered the spiritual disintegration of society in the early nineties, caused in many respects by the devaluation of the values of the older generation.

The crisis of the spiritual and moral sphere of society is not the prerogative of modernity. Thus, the dynamics of the spiritual and moral tradition in education can be traced in the history of Russia. Modern authors describe its historical changes depending on the change in fundamental values and tasks of society [4]. For example, tradition in medieval Russia was rooted in religion and presented to Orthodox Christians, primarily in the image of Christ. At the beginning of the XVIII century, the state begins to rise above the church, a new ideal "a state man, a servant to the king and the fatherland" is formulated. The ideal of a citizen useful to the state and the Fatherland was characteristic of imperial Russia. A return to the moral-religious approach takes place in the 19th century. Alexander I cancels the book "On the Positions of Man and Citizen" in educational institutions, and the status of the main educational and educational subject is returned to the Law of God. However, this does not fundamentally change the state educational policy. Its main content remains the education of trustworthy subjects, loyal and useful to the monarchy and the Fatherland. After the October Revolution of 1917, the state regains full control over the citizen and his private life. At the end of the last and first years of this century, a new educational goal is being constructed - the formation of a free and creative personality in its self-determination and development. Moreover, the important point is that only a moral person can be free.

Thus, when analyzing the historical dynamics of the spiritual and moral traditions of Russian education, there is a tendency to gradual release from control over the private,

personal life of a citizen. Today it can be argued that the Russian school is called upon to form a free, creative, proactive, self-developing personality.

The above provisions play a special role in relation to students, and in particular, future teachers.

Features of the current state of education are to strengthen its multicultural nature. The modern interpretation of the concept of "multicultural education" causes controversy and doubts. The International Encyclopedia of Education (1994) limits it to the framework of national, racial, ethnic culture and sees its goal in fostering a tolerant attitude towards other cultures, in developing knowledge and understanding of differences and similarities between them. In this case, "multicultural education" is synonymous with "multiethnic" [5].

The most comprehensive and concise definition of the concept of multicultural education considers it as a pedagogical process in which two or more cultures are represented that differ in language, ethnicity, nationality or race, suggesting many requirements for the personality of the teacher.

The main idea of modern authors is that the main goal of a multicultural education teacher is to provide students with relevant knowledge; the formation and development of skills that will allow them to actively and productively interact with representatives of different cultures. The most important task of multicultural education in Russia is to foster respect for cultural differences and to prepare young people for life in a multicultural environment [6].

Without a doubt, the condition for the implementation of the formulated task of multicultural education is reliance on the degree of formation of the moral sphere of students.

The key figure in the process of implementing the principles of multicultural education is the personality of the teacher, whose main task is to harmonize the relationship between the student and the changing socio-cultural environment. According to N.M. Lebedeva and A.N. Tatarko, the importance of the formation of readiness, the ability of future teachers to work in a multicultural environment is widely discussed in applied psychological and pedagogical research, which is the content of multicultural education [7]. Many authors note difficulties in this process, namely, in the formation of future teachers of such skills as the ability to self-determination in culture, pedagogical tact and compliance with traditional national etiquette. We can say that deep, psychological structures, or awareness of oneself included in the culture, awareness of the state of culture and attitudes towards it undergo the least dynamics. In fact, the actualization of their own ethnic identity does not occur, or ethnic identity does not reveal itself. The lack of formation of these features among domestic students leads to a misunderstanding and rejection of the national characteristics of foreign students, which complicates intercultural communication and, in general, the implementation of the goals of multicultural education.

The formation of the corresponding personality structures directly depends on how relevant the problems of intercultural communication for future teachers are, which determines their sensitivity to solving pedagogical problems [8]. These features can be illustrated by a study of the relevance of ethnocultural problems for students of a pedagogical university (N = 75). For example, in response to the question "How relevant are ethnocultural problems for you?", 59% of the subjects answered that they were relevant "for my people" and only 12% of the subjects answered that "relevant for me personally". The rest found it difficult to answer. Moreover, ethnocultural problems were understood as "the state of national culture, the need to preserve ethnocultural traditions, and a personal contribution to the achievement of international peace".

In our opinion, the main reason for the present difficulties in preparing future teachers for work in multicultural education is the insufficient inclusion of students in the process of intercultural communication, as well as the insufficient study of the impact of the multicultural environment of an educational institution on the student's personal development, including on the value, moral sphere.

Theoretical basis

As mentioned above, the problems of educating the morality of the young generation are very relevant at the present time. This is due to an increase in individual freedom, fuzziness, ambiguity of moral standards. A special role is played by the solution of these issues in the student environment of pedagogical universities [9]. It is worth noting that many researchers believe that student age refers to a very sensitive stage in the moral development of a person, due to the formation and strengthening of self-awareness and the establishment of a stable "image of the Self" in connection with interaction with society [1; 10].

Students develop conscious and controlled regulation of their attitude to themselves, to the world around them and to their activities. The moral position of the individual acts as a regulator. The moral position of a person is a complex formation, the essence of which is reflected in the psychological system of a person. The moral position is characterized by self-organization, temporary development as a component of the meaning-forming sphere of the personality.

The problem of the formation of the moral position of the personality was highlighted in the works of domestic scientists, such as O.S. Bodalev, T.A. Slavinskaya [11; 12]. It was considered in the writings of K.A. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, A.G. Asmolov [13; 14]. As a type of relationship; it was considered in the works of L.I. Bozhovich, L.S. Rubinstein [15; 16] as a system of motives and attitudes. As subjective representations of a person about values.

In our opinion, a moral position is a conscious selective multicomponent position of a person, based on her experience and characterizing a person's ability to distinguish and choose the initial moral components that determine her behavior and way of life.

In our work, we identified **the following components of a moral position:**

- **motivational-value component**, including motives and needs that characterize the actions of the individual [17; 18], as well as moral values and ideals of personality [19-21]. The motivational component of this component is the personality orientation. Focus on the Other plays a special significance for a moral position. We have already noted that a humanistic orientation is necessary for students of a pedagogical profile [22].
- values are non-situational and act as an assessment of the situation, choice of action in it. In the concept of S. Schwartz, which we chose to study the hierarchy of students' values, the idea of the universality of basic human values and the motivating nature of value orientations is highlighted. Schwartz distinguishes values on the basis, as a type of motivational goals, which they express [23].
- **the emotional component**, which includes moral relations, feelings and experiences [24; 25].
- **a communicative component** that determines the ability of an individual to build social connections. Interpersonal interaction is the main way of transmitting

sociocultural knowledge. Intercultural communication in a multicultural environment between students affects not only the external, objective way of life in its diversity, but also the internal, subjective world of the personality, which is determined by the moral position [26].

- **the regulatory component**, which is the basis for the manifestation of personality activity.

The level of formation of a moral position is determined by the level of development of its components, which is closely related to the cultural and social space in which the individual is located [27]. The multicultural environment of the university is such a space for students.

In the context of this statement, we consider the multicultural environment of the university as the main system of conditions and factors necessary for the moral development of students. Recently, a lot of attention has been paid to education and upbringing in a multicultural environment [28].

The discussion by the Russian scientific community of the problems of multicultural education allows us to highlight several important aspects of its development. As noted by E.N. Yarkova, the basis of multicultural education is the understanding of the world of the surrounding culture as a single and, at the same time, diverse, which presents certain difficulties for the individual [29]. Their resolution requires a special, dialogical way of thinking. This way of thinking requires its formation. Despite the fact that multicultural education carries a lot of positives, makes the sphere of educational activity more multifaceted, contributes to the formation of a diverse vision of the world, aims to educate a “one-dimensional” person, forms tolerance as a moral principle and norm of behavior, multicultural education strategies carry and certain restrictions. Putting at the center of analysis the idea of the diversity of the world of culture, they belittle the idea of its unity. The author emphasizes that multicultural education is another side of monocultural education. We consider the following point of view to be promising that an optimal educational strategy is possible provided that the principles of monoculture and multiculturalism are combined, their mutual correction, balance. Such a strategy is dialogue. Dialogue is not a simple combination of two opposites: monoculturalism and multiculturalism. The dialogue is to search for a “middle culture”. Understanding multicultural education involves, first of all, a dialogical way of thinking based on the ideas of freedom, justice, equality, as well as understanding it as a process of involving students in the diversity of world culture, provided that it is very important to have a consistent, phased learning of native culture.

Multicultural education is based on a number of principles, among which the most important and resolving the above contradictions between monocultural and multicultural approaches in education, in our opinion, are:

- reflection in the educational material of original features in the cultures of the peoples of Russia and the world;
- disclosure in the cultures of Russian peoples of common traditions that allow living in peace, harmony, tolerance, harmony;
- familiarization with world culture, the interdependence of countries and peoples in modern conditions;
- the formation of tolerance to the views, morals, habits of various peoples, nations, religions.

Thus, the implementation of a multicultural approach in education requires the formation of students' ability to see the general and special in the surrounding ethnocultural diversity,

the development of a special way of thinking that provides an understanding of the equality and the right to diversity of ethnocultural manifestations, the formation of a tolerant attitude to ethnocultural diversity, as well as the preservation of their own ethnocultural identity.

Methodology

An empirical study of the influence of a multicultural educational environment on the formation of the moral position of future teachers was carried out, based on the provisions formulated above and with the aim of checking some of them.

In the context of our study, the multicultural environment of the university is defined by us as *“the educational environment of the university, where the development of intercultural, social, educational relations that contribute to the formation of the moral position of students' personalities, their universal qualities and values”*.

As noted above, a distinctive feature that defines a multicultural educational environment is the understanding of the unity and diversity of cultures. To achieve this, close interaction between the subjects of a multicultural environment is necessary, which is achieved through dialogue.

Demisenova Sh.S. and Bakhtin M.M. argue that it is possible to achieve a high level of self-development and self-knowledge of students only through a dialogue of cultures [30].

An empirical study was conducted on the basis of the Voronezh State Pedagogical University. The study involved 95 students of 4 years of study at the Faculty of Physics and Mathematics.

The division into experimental groups was carried out on the principle of including students in a multicultural environment. So, the experimental group (EG) included students included in a multicultural educational environment, in the framework of which there is a dialogue between students of different nationalities (Russians, Turkmen, Uzbeks, Ukrainians). Students of this group interact closely, spend a large amount of time together in the educational process and outside it.

Students of the control group (CG) **transferred from another university**, where they interacted outside the multicultural environment, in isolated groups with a monocultural composition (Russians).

The aim of the study is to empirically determine the difference in the levels of development of the components of the moral position of students of a teacher training university. We assume that communication with students of other nationalities, requiring interaction, understanding, and contact, contributes to the formation of a more pronounced moral position.

A set of techniques was applied in an empirical study:

- Questionnaire "Diagnosis of goodwill (Campbell scale) was used to study students' readiness for communication;
- S. Schwartz's value questionnaire was used to determine the value structure of a person (the value component of a person's moral position) and to build a hierarchy of values;
- The method of O.F. Potemkina "Diagnosis of social and psychological attitudes of the personality in the motivational sphere" was used to study the motivational sphere of the personality (the motivational component of the moral position);
- The methodology "Scale of Emotional Response" by A. Mehrabyan and N. Epstein

was used to study the emotional response of students (the emotional component of the moral position of a person);

- The methodology of I. Timoschuk “Questionnaire DUMEOLP-diagnostics of the level of moral and ethical responsibility of the individual” was used to study the stability of the moral position of the personality of students [31].

Results and discussion

The results of the analysis of normative ideals and individual values are presented in Table 1 (the Mann-Whitney test was used for calculations).

Table 1
Comparative analysis of normative ideals and individual values in groups studying in a multicultural and monocultural environment

Index	Monocultural (CG) (n = 45)			Multicultural (EG) (n = 50)			Significance of differences (p ≤ 0.05; p ≤ 0.01)
	The average	Standard deviation	Rank	The average	Standard deviation	Rank	
Scale of normative ideals							
Conformity	4,49	1,235	5	5,00	1,062	3	0,019
Traditions	3,69	1,459	9	3,76	1,050	10	0,000
Kindness	4,84	1,093	2	5,23	1,035	1	0,059
Universalism	4,27	1,088	7	4,46	1,047	7	0,149
Independence	4,63	1,179	3	4,51	0,952	6	0,005
Stimulation	4,20	1,101	8	3,98	1,437	8	0,018
Hedonism	4,63	1,317	4	4,68	1,354	4	0,667
Progress	4,35	1,113	6	4,55	1,200	5	0,091
Power	3,66	1,288	10	3,81	1,281	9	0,000
Safety	4,98	0,926	1	5,05	1,079	2	0,169
Individual Values Scale							
Conformity	2,09	0,934	6	1,84	0,836	8	0,374
Traditions	1,61	1,123	9	1,47	0,970	9	0,107
Kindness	2,46	0,922	2	2,51	0,779	1	0,056
Universalism	2,41	1,037	3	2,18	0,770	5	0,065
Independence	2,49	0,985	1	2,48	0,847	2	0,454
Stimulation	1,82	1,180	8	2,23	0,732	3	0,104
Hedonism	2,14	1,182	5	2,12	1,034	6	0,990
Progress	1,89	1,068	7	1,89	0,882	7	0,424
Power	1,12	1,005	10	0,94	0,968	10	0,421
Safety	2,23	0,920	4	2,21	0,797	4	0,367

On the scale of normative ideals, statistically significant differences were identified by such values as “stimulation” ($p \leq 0.05$), “independence” ($p \leq 0.01$). These values are more expressed in the group of students in a monocultural environment (CG). Values on this scale show values that, in the process of educating the individual, have become standards for the choice of behavior. That is, these values reflect not only the value system of a particular person, but also the value system of the society in which it was educated. Moreover, the

value of “conformity” is more pronounced in the experimental group (EG). It can be assumed that the severity of this value in the EG is due to the need to more closely coordinate their actions with foreign students, and in some significant, ethical situations to accept the requirements of the group.

Values at the individual level in their values differ from the scale of standards. So, in the experimental group of students, the values of “kindness” and “independence” are more expressed, while the values of “power” and “tradition” are of the least importance.

In the group of students who studied in a monocultural environment, the value of “independence” is of the greatest importance, and the values of “power” and “tradition” are of least value. The value of “kindness” is higher in the group of students who studied in a multicultural environment, and “universalism” in a group with a monocultural environment. It should be noted that the least value in both the experimental and control groups has the value of tradition. Such data indicate a relationship to both their own and to foreign cultural traditions. This confirms the results of the study of the importance of ethnocultural problems for students that were not relevant for students at the personal level, which may affect the success of intercultural communication. At the same time, we recall that ethnocultural problems were understood as “the state of national culture, the need to preserve ethnocultural traditions, and personal contribution to achieving international peace”.

In general, according to the methodology, it can be noted that the groups have a similar structure at the normative level, hierarchy of values, which suggests that the transfer of moral standards in the process of educating students, including the general cultural value system, is approximately the same, and there are universal, universal values in different cultures. So, students of both groups put the values of “kindness”, “security” at the top of the hierarchy, and the values of “power”, “tradition” and “stimulation” are of the least importance. This hierarchy structure shows the priorities of modern society.

According to the scale of individual preferences, the overall picture of the hierarchy of values also has a similar structure. However, unlike value standards, the value of independence in both groups acquires high significance, and the value of “conformism” becomes less significant. This, on the whole, indicates a tendency characteristic of the student age to strengthen independence in their own actions.

No significant differences were found in most indicators as a result of a comparative analysis of socio-psychological attitudes in the experimental and control groups (Table 2).

Table 2

Comparative analysis of socio-psychological settings in the experimental and control groups

Index	Monocultural (CG) (n = 45)		Multicultural (EG) (n = 50)		Significance of Differences
	The average	Standard deviation	The average	Standard deviation	
Process	6,36	1,798	6,76	1,623	0,456
Result	5,71	1,926	5,36	1,675	0,560
Altruism	5,40	2,060	5,64	2,145	0,384
Selfishness	4,13	1,817	3,24	1,975	0,000

The table shows that a statistically significant difference is observed in the focus on selfishness ($p \leq 0.01$). The focus on egoism is much higher in the control group of students studying in a monocultural environment.

The focus on altruism / egoism is of particular importance for our study, as a criterion for the formation of students' moral position. A high indicator of the orientation toward egoism means that it has the highest value motivational value, and reflects the immaturity of the individual, her willingness to act, focusing only on her own needs.

A comparative analysis of empathy, goodwill and moral responsibility in groups revealed statistically significant differences in the level of empathy ($p \leq 0.01$) and goodwill ($p \leq 0.05$). Both indicators prevail in the experimental group (Table 3).

Table 3

Comparative analysis of empathy, goodwill and moral responsibility in the control and experimental groups

Index	Monocultural (CG) (n = 45)		Multicultural (EG) (n = 50)		Significance of Differences
	The average	Standard deviation	The average	Standard deviation	
Empathyl evel	72,67	9,055	74,88	10,089	0,003
Friendliness level	5,02	1,913	5,82	1,612	0,040
Level of moral responsibility	9,20	4,429	8,78	6,822	0,252

The values of the level of empathy and goodwill in a group of students studying in a multicultural environment are higher than those of students studying in a monocultural environment. So, students of this group are more responsive to the emotional state of others, more empathize with other people. Significantly higher indicator of the level of goodwill in a group of students with a multicultural composition, this means that students in this group are ready to make interpersonal contacts and are positively configured to work together with other people.

However, the level of moral and ethical regulation in the group of students with a monocultural composition is higher than in the multicultural group. This indicates the conscious regulation of their moral actions and actions [32]. However, the high value of one component of the moral position does not indicate its general level of formation. Since according to the results of other methods, significant indicators of the components of a moral position, such as a focus on altruism, the level of empathy and the level of goodwill, are lower in this group than in the group of students studying in a multicultural environment.

Following the logic of our study, the formation of a moral position will depend on the level of development of its structural components. So, having determined these levels, we can say that students studying in a multicultural environment have more developed components of their moral position, such as emotional, communicative, motivational and value. This indicates the positive impact of the multicultural environment in their development. However, a lower level of development of the regulatory component, which is the link necessary to activate the commission of moral acts and actions, is revealed. That is, we observe the internal readiness of students of this group to commit moral acts and actions, but we see a lack of readiness for their external manifestation. So, we believe that for the development of the internal regulation of students' moral behavior it is necessary

to develop a set of measures aimed at developing the regulatory component of the moral position, which will contribute to its external manifestation.

Thus, a comparison of the results of the severity of the components of the moral position among students in the control and experimental groups does not show obvious, fundamental differences in its formation as a whole.

We can assume that the weakness of the severity of the regulatory component of the moral position in the multicultural group is due to the lack of dialogicity of intercultural communication in the group and the insufficient use of its regulatory potential.

Intercultural dialogue is based on mutual perceptual images that are in a dichotomy relationship. Despite understanding dichotomies as contradictions or opposites, perceptual images form either dialogic or oppositional dichotomies [10]. These dichotomies include the following: "They are We," "We are You." "We are I", "I am You." Oppositional dichotomies are "They are We," dialogical "We are I," "I am You," "We are You."

The key to intercultural communication is the notion of "alien" or ethnocultural image of "They". Porshnev B.F. also spoke about the ethnocultural cognitive opposition "They Are Us" [33]. At the dawn of human history, humanity needed to meet someone "They" in order for the image of "We" to appear in people's self-consciousness. In ontogenesis, the formation of the image of "They" in self-awareness is also primary. Only on its basis then the image of "We" is formed and the transition to the level of "I" takes place [34]. That is, the image of "They" is primary in comparison with "We". In order to identify with "We," it is necessary to contrast themselves with "They".

Conclusion

Thus, it can be argued that one of the reasons for the difficulties encountered in the multicultural educational process is the lack of mutual understanding and acceptance among domestic and foreign students, or the lack of expression of intercultural dialogue. There is no transition from the opposition "We Are Them" to the dichotomy "We Are You" or "I Are You" in the process of intercultural communication. Moreover, an important task in organizing intercultural dialogue is to overcome this oppositional dichotomy.

In our opinion, the implementation of the task of achieving intercultural dialogue can, for example, be served by the organization and features of the presentation of educational information. An effective strategy, in our opinion, is the use of interactive technologies in practical exercises. We have tested the following algorithm of practical exercises in ethnoculturally mixed groups with the aim of overcoming the opposition dichotomy "We-They" and the transition to dialogue. For example, the organization of diagnostic exercises aimed at self-examination of the ethnocultural images "They" and "We" with subsequent reflection of similarities and differences is recommended at the first stage. The next stage involves the transition to non-verbal technologies, for example, training exercises aimed at coordinating group movements at the level of the general group "We" (for example, performing a joint group movement with a complex algorithm). The following are tasks that reveal semantic and value ethnocultural differences (greeting, acquaintance, conflict resolution, etc.). Students were offered problem tasks for working in microgroups and pairs at the last stage. A prerequisite was the requirement of a joint decision. Each stage involved a subsequent

reflection and analysis of the difficulties encountered. Such a sequence was achieved the task of understanding oneself (at the level of “I”) and understanding of another (at the level of “You”) as a representative of ethnic culture, as well as ethnocultural differences, as well as awareness of common features. In the process of such classes, students quickly enough switched to dialogue dialogue, namely, from the dichotomy “We are They”, to the dichotomy “We Are You”, and at the interpersonal level - to the dichotomy “I Am You”. Such a strategy of classes in multicultural groups influenced the effectiveness of the educational process, encouraged students to work together, increased motivation for ethnocultural self-knowledge and intercultural communication at the dialogue level.

It can be assumed that educational activity built on a certain algorithm corresponding to the psychological mechanism of the phenomenon’s functioning can be considered precisely as a set of measures aimed at developing the regulatory component of a moral position, which will contribute more to its external manifestation.

REFERENCES

1. Trofimova N. B. The development of the spiritual and moral potential of students in the educational process (psychological and pedagogical aspect): monograph. Voronezh, Voronezh State Pedagogical University Publ., 2008. 70-81 p. (in Russ.)
2. Volovikova M. I. Representations of the Russian moral ideal. Moscow, Institute of Psychology RAS Publ., 2004. (in Russ.)
3. Danilyuk A. Ya. The concept of spiritual and moral development and education of the personality of a citizen of Russia. Moscow, Enlightenment Publ., 2009. (in Russ.)
4. Damindarova F.V. Spiritual and moral tradition in society. The author's abstract dissertation of a doctor of philosophical sciences. Chelyabinsk, Chelyabinsk State University Publ., 2011. Available at: https://new-disser.ru/_avtoreferats/01005085561.pdf (accessed 21 May 2020)
5. Gaganova O.K. Multicultural education in the United States: theoretical foundations and content. Obtained from PORTALUS.RU, 2007. Available at: https://portalus.ru/modules/shkola/rus_readme.php?subaction=showfull&id=1193320202&archive=1195596857&start_from=&ucat (accessed 23 May 2020)
6. Bessarabova I.S. Goals, objectives and principles of multicultural education in Russia and the USA. *Modern high technology*, 2008, no. 8, pp. 73-75. (in Russ.)
7. Lebedeva N. M., Tatarko, A. N. Culture as a factor in social progress. Moscow: Justinform, 1974. (in Russ.)
8. Trofimova N. B., Zhukov, A. M. Features of intercultural communication of students in the multicultural environment of the university. *Bulletin of Tambov State University. Series: Social Sciences*, 2015, vol. 4 (4), pp. 40-43. (in Russ.)
9. Trofimova N. B. The forming of world image as means of development of the attitude towards the world in the youth. *International Conference on Education, Science and Social Development (ESSD2019)*. Changsha, Hunan, China, 2019. pp. 93-196. doi: 10.2991 / 19.2019.114. (in Russ.)
10. Stepanova G.S. Features of the ethnic identity of Russians: problems and prospects of research. *Social Psychology and Society*, 2012, vol. 3 (4), pp. 41-52. (in Russ.)
11. Bodalev A. A. Psychology of personality. Moscow, MSU Publ., 1988. 188 p.
12. Slavinskaya I. S. the Problem of studying moral orientations: current state // "Baitursynov readings - 2014". *Education and science of Kazakhstan at the beginning of the XXI century: problems, searches, solutions: mater. conf. Kostanay*, 2014. pp. 159-164.
13. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya K. A. Activity and personality psychology. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1980. 335 p.
14. Asmolov A. G. Activity and installation. Moscow, MSU Publ., 1979. 151 p. (in Russ.)
15. Bozhovich L.I. Personality and its formation in childhood. Moscow, Education Publ., 1968. (in Russ.)
16. Rubinstein S.D. Man and the world. Moscow, 1998. (in Russ.)
17. Kon I. S. Psychology of early youth. Moscow, Prosveshchenie Publ., 1989. 255 p. (in Russ.)
18. Rubinstein L. Fundamentals of general psychology: In 2 vols. Moscow, Pedagogy Publ., 1989, vol. 2, 322 p. (in Russ.)
19. Antilogova L. N. Psychological mechanisms of development of moral consciousness of the individual. Monograph. Omsk, OmSPU Publ., 1999. 184 p. (in Russ.)
20. Bratus B. S. Anomalies of personality. Moscow, Mysl Publ., 1988. 304 p. (in Russ.)
21. Drobnitsky O. G. Problems of morality. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1977. 333 p.
22. Trofimova N. B., Zhukova A. M. Value orientations in the structure of the professional orientation of the personality

- of the future teacher. *Problems of Modern Humanitarian Education*, 2017, no. 55-6, pp. 266-275. (in Rus)
23. Schwartz T. (Ed.: Theodor Schwartz, Geoffrey M. White, Catherine A. Lutz). *Anthropology and Psychology. New direction in Psychological Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
 24. Kovalev A.G. *Psychology of personality*. Moscow, Education Publ., 1970. (in Russ.)
 25. Ilyin E. P. *Motivation and motives*. Saint-Petersburg, Peter Publ., 2011. (in Russ.)
 26. Tikhonova V.I. The formation of the moral culture of the future teacher in the educational dialogue: Diss. PhD Ped. Sci., Voronezh, 1998. Available at: https://viewer.rusneb.ru/ru/000199_000009_000190778?page=1&rotate=0&theme=white (accessed 24 May 2020)
 27. Bezumova L. G., Yarushkin N. N. Changes in values in the semantic sphere of the personality of students in the process of their education at a university. *Bulletin of the Samara Humanitarian Academy. Series: Psychology*, 2008, no 1, pp. 70-81. (in Russ.)
 28. Bulceva M.A., Lebedeva N.M. Interconnection of experience of intercultural interactions, acculturation expectations and creativity among Russian students. *Cultural-historical psychology*, 2019, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 51-59. doi: 10.17759/chp.2019150306/ (in Rus)
 29. Yarkova E.N. The philosophy of multicultural education and its alternatives. *Topos. Literary and philosophical journal*, 2004. Available at: <https://www.topos.ru/article/2130> (accessed 24 May 2020)
 30. Demisenova S. S. The role of the multicultural environment in the self-development of students of pedagogical universities. *Modern higher school: innovative aspect*, 2012, no. 1, pp. 53 - 58. (in Rus)
 31. Raigorodsky D. Ya. *Practical psychodiagnostics. Methods and tests (Study Guide)*. Samara: Bahrakh-M, 2006 (in Russ)
 32. Veselova E.K. Characteristics of moral and ethical responsibility among young people with subjective and objective orientation. International Conference. *Psychology of the XXI century: a systems approach and interdisciplinary research: a collection of scientific papers of participants int. scientific conf. young scientists: in 2 volumes*, St. Petersburg, 2017, vol. 1, pp. 265 - 269. (in Russ.)
 33. Porshnev, B.F. *About the beginning of human history (Problems of paleopsychology)*. Moscow, Thought Publ., 1974. (in Russ.)
 34. Stepanova, G.S. The importance of dialogic dichotomies in intercultural communication. *Symbol of Science*, 2015, no. 12, pp. 238-242. (in Russ.)

Информация об авторах

Трофимова Наталья Борисовна
(Россия, Воронеж)

Профессор, доктор психологических наук,
заведующий кафедрой общей и педагогической
психологии

Воронежский государственный педагогический
университет

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1690-4840

Researcher ID: AAC-4417-2021

Степанова Галина Семеновна

(Россия, Воронеж)

Кандидат психологических наук, доцент кафедры
общей и педагогической психологии

Воронежский государственный педагогический
университет

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4848-9314

Researcher ID: AAC-5356-2021

Жукова Аннелия Мгеровна

(Россия, Воронеж)

Ассистент кафедры общей и педагогической
психологии

Воронежский государственный педагогический
университет

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4367-442X

Researcher ID: AAC-1797-2021.

Гончаренко Елена Семеновна

(Россия, Воронеж)

Старший преподаватель кафедры общей и
педагогической психологии

Воронежский государственный педагогический
университет

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1791-5189.

Researcher ID: AAC-5796-2021

Information about the authors

Natalia B. Trofimova

(Russia, Voronezh)

Professor,

Doctor of Psychology,

Head of the Department of General and Educational
Psychology

Voronezh State Pedagogical University

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1690-4840

Researcher ID: AAC-4417-2021

Galina S. Stepanova

(Russia, Voronezh)

PhD in Psychology,

Associate Professor of the Department of General and
Educational Psychology

Voronezh State Pedagogical University

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4848-9314

Researcher ID: AAC-5356-2021

Annelia M. Zhukova

(Russia, Voronezh)

Assistant at the Department of General and Educational
Psychology

Voronezh State Pedagogical University

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4367-442X

Researcher ID: AAC-1797-2021.

Elena S. Goncharenko

(Russia, Voronezh)

Senior Lecturer at the Department of General and
Pedagogical Psychology

Voronezh State Pedagogical University

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1791-5189.

Researcher ID: AAC-5796-2021