

¹Kulgildinova T., ²Zhumabekova G.

¹doctor of pedagogical sciences, professor, Abylai Khan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages, Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: umo@ablaikhan.kz

²candidate of pedagogical sciences, docent
Abylai Khan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages,
Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: zhuma_a@mail.ru

**FORMATION OF THE SUBJECT OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN
FOREIGN-LANGUAGE EDUCATION**

The article deals with the formation of the language personality, which is characteristic of language education. The language education in Kazakhstan includes teaching Kazakh and Russian languages, respectively; the language personality is formed at study of these languages. When studying a foreign language, a subject of intercultural communication is formed. In this regard, the linguistic personality has two of the above-named species, depending on what is the object of study language or foreign language education. A student in foreign-language education uses cognitive strategies of his culture as basic cognitive images, he uses them in cognition of the new culture of the country of the studied language. As a subject of intercultural communication, such a student is guided by new knowledge about his own culture discovered in the process of cognition of his own culture.

In the paper the main trends in teaching a foreign language are formulated. In particular, the revision of strategic directions for teaching a foreign language leads to a revision of the methodological training of a foreign language teacher and requires a teacher of a new education; the methodological basis for teaching a foreign language is the cognitive-linguistic culture methodology; the object of study «lingva-culture» synthesizes «language-culture-personality» and reflects the goal of forming «subject of intercultural communication» as an integral subject of scientific researches; intercultural and communicative competence has become the object of the formation of a foreign language.

Key words: language education, foreign language education, subject of intercultural communication, language personality.

¹Кульгильдинова Т.А., ²Жумабекова Г.Б.

¹педагогика ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: umo@ablaikhan.kz

²педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент
Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті,
Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: zhuma_a@mail.ru

Шет тілі білім берудегі мәдениетаралық қарым-қатынас субъектісін қалыптастыру

Мақалада тілдік білім беруге байланысты тілдік тұлға қалыптастыру мәселесі қарастырылады. Қазақстандағы тілдік білім қазақ және орыс тілдерін меңгертуді қамтиды және тілдік тұлға осы тілдерді оқытуға сәйкес қалыптасады. Шет тілдерін оқытуда мәдениетаралық қарым-қатынас субъектісі қалыптасады. Осыған байланысты тілдік тұлға әртүрлі оқыту нысаны болып табылатын тілдік немесе басқа тілді білім беру сияқты екі мүмкіндікке ие болады. Басқа тілде білім алуда студент тілін оқып отырған елдің мәдениетін тану үшін базистік когнитивті бейне ретінде өз мәдениетінің танымдық стратегияларын қолданады.

Мәдениетаралық қарым-қатынас субъектісі ретінде мұндай студент өзге мәдениетті тану үдерісінде байқалған өз мәдениеті туралы жаңа білімді бағдар етеді. Мақалада шет тілін оқытудың негізгі бағыттары жинақталып мазмұндалады. Атап айтқанда, шет тілін оқытудың стратегиялық бағыттарын, шет тілі оқытушысын дайындаудың әдіснамасын қайта қарастыруды және жаңа білім беру мұғалімін талап етеді; когнитивті-лингвистикалық әдіснама шет тілін оқытудың

әдіснамасы болады; «лингвомәдениет» оқыту нысаны «тіл-мәдениет-тұлғаны» құрайды және ғылыми зерттеулердің интегративті пәні ретінде «мәдениетаралық қарым-қатынас субъектісін» қалыптастыру мақсатын айқындайды; мәдениетаралық және коммуникативтік құзыреттіліктер шет тілін оқыту нысаны болып саналады.

Түйін сөздер: тілдік білім, басқа тілде білім беру, мәдениетаралық қарым-қатынас субъектісі, тілдік тұлға.

¹Культгильдинова Т.А., ²Жумабекова Г.Б.

¹доктор пед.наук, профессор, Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана, Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: umo@ablaikhan.kz

²кандидат пед.наук, доцент, Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана, Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: zhuma_a@mail.ru

Формирование субъекта межкультурной коммуникации в иноязычном образовании

В статье рассматриваются вопросы формирования языковой личности, которые характерны для языкового образования. Языковое образование в Казахстане включает обучение казахскому и русскому языкам, и соответственно, языковая личность формируется при изучении этих языков. При изучении иностранного языка формируется субъект межкультурной коммуникации. В связи с этим языковая личность имеет две вышеназванные разновидности в зависимости от того, что является объектом изучения – языковое или иноязычное образование. Студент в иноязычном образовании пользуется познавательными стратегиями своей культуры как базисными когнитивными образами, он использует их в познании новой культуры страны изучаемого языка. Как субъект межкультурной коммуникации такой студент ориентируется на выявленные в процессе познания чужой культуры нового познания о собственной культуре.

В статье сформулированы и обобщены основные тенденции обучения иностранному языку. В частности, пересмотр стратегических направлений обучения иностранному языку ведет к пересмотру методологической подготовки преподавателя иностранного языка и требует учителя нового образования; методологической основой обучения иностранному языку становится когнитивно-лингвокультурная методология; объект изучения – «лингвокультура» синтезирует «язык-культуру-личность» и отражает цель формирования «субъекта межкультурной коммуникации» как интегрального предмета научных исследований; межкультурная и коммуникативная компетентность стали объектом образования иностранного языка.

Ключевые слова: языковое образование, иноязычное образование, субъект межкультурной коммуникации, языковая личность.

Introduction

At present, the studies on the theory and methodology of teaching foreign languages show an increasing interest in the ways of forming a language personality in the process of teaching languages. This direction is considered as a fundamentally new approach to teaching subjects of the language cycle. Quite justified in this case is the statement of Yu.N. Karaulov: «As long as the language learning models are limited to the systemic representation of the language itself and do not invade the structure of the personality, the language personality, they are doomed to remain something external, alien to the object of language teaching».

The first such approach to teaching languages was developed by G.I. Bogin in the 1980s. Solving the question of the success of schoolchildren preparation on philological subjects: native language and literature, foreign language, readiness to use oral and written speech in connection with the study of other subjects at school, to enter into communication in different situations in accordance with the norms of

verbal behavior, the author concludes about the need to have a certain stable evaluation criterion, which will allow to orientate in the process of constructing teaching activities. Neither language nor speech, in his opinion, by themselves cannot serve as such a criterion. In order to solve this problem, it was proposed to introduce the concept of «language personality», which would characterize the personality from the point of view of its readiness to produce speech acts, to create and accept verbal products, and to consider language components as evaluation criteria for the level of language proficiency.

Materials and Methods

Methodology. If we investigate the transformation of the concept of «language personality» in the theory and methodology of teaching foreign languages, we can identify several interpretations. Thus, in the first interpretation of the language personality, emphasis was placed on the verbal ability of the individual. The advantage of this approach to language teaching was that

for the first time the aim of language teaching became not mastering language system, separate knowledge, abilities and skills in using a language, but formation of a linguistic personality with a complex of skills and abilities to conduct speech acts [1]. At the same time, the consideration of the concept of the «linguistic personality» irrespective of the cognitive aspect of the linguistic personality when solving the problems of students' preparation for the situation of intercultural communication has become insufficient.

The modern theory and methodology of teaching foreign languages has its own understanding of the structure and content of the language personality, realized in a new direction: the formation of a secondary linguistic personality, which is defined as the totality of a person's ability to communicate at an intercultural level, which is understood as adequate interaction with representatives of other cultures.

Literature Review

As N.D. Gal'skova has mentioned, the process of the formation of the secondary language personality is associated not only with mastering the verbal code of a foreign language by the learner and the ability to use image of the world» characteristic to the bearer of this language as a representative of a particular society, thus, the author thinks that teaching of a foreign language should be aimed at involving the learners in the conceptual system of the foreign language society.

As for the term «secondary language personality», it is widely encountered in the modern scientific literature on psycholinguistics, intercultural communication, and methodology of teaching foreign languages [2]. At the same time, the theory of the formation of a secondary language personality does not have unambiguous interpretations.

The concept of «secondary language personality», introduced into the Russian methodology by I.I. Khaleeva, meaning in a broad context a linguistic personality, the formation of which occurs in the process of teaching a foreign language, has a specific interpretation with a narrower consideration in the theory and methodology of teaching foreign languages.

The modern interpretation of the concept «secondary language personality» is based on the introduction through foreign language of not only of the secondary language system of inophonic linguoculture, but also of the conceptual image of the world within which the national character and the national mentality of the native speaker are developing. In other words, the secondary linguistic

personality is a collection of human traits that consists of mastering the verbal-semantic code of the studied language, that is, the «linguistic image of the world» of the speakers of this language, and the conceptual image of the world that allows a person to understand a new social reality.

In the opinion of the proponents of the theory of the secondary language personality, the development of the properties of the «secondary language personality» in the learner, which allow him to be an effective participant in intercultural communication, is actually the strategic aim of teaching a foreign language at the present stage. According to the researchers, the realization of this aim means the development of the learner's ability to use the appropriate foreign language «technology» [3], extralinguistic information necessary for adequate communication and understanding at the intercultural level, as well as qualities that allow direct and indirect communication with representatives of other cultures. A great importance is attached to the axiological approach, when emphasis is placed on the recognition and interpretation of the motives and attitudes of a person belonging to foreign community, where a different value system operates.

The approach to teaching foreign languages as a means of intercultural communication is also based on research in the field of methodology and linguoculturology, which justify the idea that the possibility of communication between native speakers and non-native speakers is greatly complicated by differences in the perception of «world images» and the divergence of conceptual systems of different societies. For example, E.F. Tarasov states: «There is a reason to believe that the main cause for the lack of understanding in intercultural communication is not the difference in languages, since the formation of skills of speaking (writing) and listening (reading) is relatively simple, but the difference of national consciousness of communicants» .

The task of the methodology of foreign language teaching within the framework of this theory is to teach the bearer of the image of the world of one socio-cultural community to understand the carrier of another linguistic image of the world.

So, the processes of dialogue of cultures, according to G.V. Elizarova predetermined the transformation of the concept of «language personality» to the level of a mediator of cultures. As the principles of the formation of a similar level of intercultural competence the author names the principle of a culturally-related study of native and foreign languages, ethnography, speech strategies,

awareness and «experience,» the management of one's own psychological states, and empathy.

The processes of the formation of a linguistic personality in the light of its multicultural orientation are considered in the study by L.P. Khalyapin.

In the opinion of the author, the polylogue of cultures in the context of globalization is not only a horizontal interaction, but also a vertical interaction (national and ethnic cultures), the complex «cross» links of cultures developing within the framework of secular states and territorial communities that share different religious beliefs [4]; traditional cultures and cultures of post-industrial societies, developing high technologies, etc. The resulting complex network information and communication structure is assembled into a whole not through a dialogue between cultures open to interaction, but in the polylogue of a multitude of different cultures interacting by a network principle. The dialogic paradigm is already only a part of the process of interaction, for polylogism is akin to polyphonicism, based on the simultaneous intersection of diverse independent lines, but included in the whole on equal rights and forming this whole only under conditions of interaction.

In the conditions of the formed society, in a great demand is not the secondary language personality, which in the process of teaching foreign languages is attached only to the conceptual system of speakers of the second (foreign) language, but the multicultural language personality, in which the ability and willingness to interact with representatives of different countries and cultures is formed, believes L.P. Khalyapin. The multicultural language personality is a personality in whose structure the foreign language has formed such a complex of competences that allows them to navigate in the conceptospheres of universal, ethnocultural, sociocultural and individual cultural types that ensures the development of their readiness and ability to actively interact with representatives of the multicultural world, the author identifies the following competencies as components in the structure of the multicultural language personality [5-6]:

- polyconceptual, which allows to navigate in the conceptospheres of different linguistic cultures;
- polylinguistic, providing the opportunity to use English as a language of global communication or several foreign languages;
- communication and technology, which allows using Internet communication programs for interaction with representatives of different cultures.

In detailing the competence model of a multicultural language personality, the author

considers it in the form of three blocks: competency; competence; and knowledge, skills, and abilities:

- multicontractual competence consists of competences in the field of universal cultural concepts; ethnocultural concepts; sociocultural concepts; individual cultural concepts;
- polylinguistic competence is represented by competences in the field of the electronic version of the English language; or several foreign languages;
- communication and technological competency has in its content competences in the field of modern information technologies; in the field of features of Internet communication.

Thus, we can draw the following conclusion that the concept of «language personality» undergoes transformation due to the emergence of new achievements in basic sciences (linguistics, psycholinguistics) and the requirements that society makes to the system of teaching foreign languages at each new stage of its development.

Analysis of modern approaches to the theory of language personality shows that the methodology of teaching foreign languages is aimed at the scientific substantiation of various models of the formation of a language personality in the conditions of instruction and, therefore, the object of its interests is the linguistic personality as the aim of teaching, and also the process of «transferring» and developing the ability to verbal communication in the studied language [7-8].

With regard to such maximal qualitative levels of appropriation of another culture and language as the personality of the «subject of the dialogue of culture», «secondary linguistic personality», «multicultural language personality», «mediator of cultures», characterized by the level of possession of foreign lingual culture, equated to the level of the bearer of a foreign language and culture, then, in our opinion, in the absence of a linguistic and sociocultural environment, this will be impossible or, at least, difficult [9].

We share S.S. Kunanbaeva's opinion, who proposes the level of the personality of the «subject of intercultural communication» as «the highest attainable quality level in the absence of a linguistic and sociocultural environment» [7].

The technologies for the formation of intercultural and communicative competences are methods of critical thinking, and methods of problem teaching (O.S. Vinogradova).

As for the technologies for the formation of intercultural and communicative competence in the conditions of the secondary school, the formation and establishment of the «subject of intercultural

communication» is achieved «step by step through mastering specific indicators of the quality of training in accordance with internationally standard requirements» [7, p.68].

Six levels of mastering FL in the model of «Common European Competences», unifying the requirements for the level of training in a foreign language, are projectively recommended, as achievable, at the level of the national education system:

for the primary school, a starter program is recommended;

for the basic stage (grades 5-10) – levels A1, A2, 2;¹²

for profile classes 12-years (11-12 grades) – level B1 and profile-oriented educational programs;

for specialized schools – programs and standards of the 4th level (B2);

for technical and professional educational institutions – level B1 and the basis of LSP (professional program);

for post-secondary professional education institutions – level B2 and the basis of the LSP;

for non-linguistic universities – level B2 and full course LSP (professional program);

for language universities – mastering the levels of B2, C1, C2, LAP (language for academic purposes) and specially-professional programs LSP;

for magistracy – levels C1, C2 of the second FL for linguistic universities; Level C1 of the first FL for non-linguistic universities; LSP – for the profile magistracy; LAP, LSP – for research and development.

Thus, the Kazakhstani methodical school gave its methodological interpretation of the modern concept of foreign language education, set forth in the work of S.S. Kunanbayeva, which, in fact, is the general line for the development of foreign-language education in the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The assessment system is certification requirements of the country of the studied language. Orientation to the international certification system makes it possible to include in the content of foreign language education those requirements that are defined in a particular system.

¹The proficiency levels of «Common European Framework:

A1 – survival level	} A – elementary command in FL
A2 – waystage level	
B1 – Thresholdlevel	} B – expressing oneself in FL
B2 – Vantagelevel	
C1 – Proficiencylevel	} C – FLfluency
C2 – Masterylevel	

The complexity and dynamism of the development and functioning of the sphere of modern foreign language education impose new demands on all its subjects, and first of all on the teacher. Therefore, an important factor in the success and effectiveness of foreign-language education is the methodological training of foreign language teachers.

In V.Sitarov’s opinion, it represents a structural formation, presupposing the presence of three main components, including, in turn, a number of key competences:

– communicative component, including language, speech, socio-cultural competence;

– didactic component in the form of competence, which is an acquired synthesis of knowledge, abilities, skills of creative pedagogical activity, functioning as modes of activity;

– reflexive component as a personal competence: a regulator of personal achievements, an impetus to self-knowledge and professional growth.

I.A. Bredikhina interprets the composition of the professional competence of a foreign language teacher somewhat differently, defining the following components of competence:

– communicative-cultural competence, consisting of linguistic, speech, linguocultural subcompetences;

– general scientific competence, consisting of cognitive, literary-theoretical, historical-literary, research subcompetences;

– psychological-pedagogical competence, consisting of psychological, pedagogical, methodological subcomponents;

– personal competence;

– self-educational competence, consisting of psychological, methodological, lingua-communicative, professionally-applied subcompetences.

O.B. Bigich believes that the result of the methodological education of future teachers of a foreign language (FL) is the personality and professionalism of the teacher, in fact, being parity categories [10]. The object of personal and methodological development of students as future teachers of primary school, according to O.D. Bigich, includes professional-pedagogical orientation, critical thinking and a number of personal qualities, methodological culture and educational autonomy.

In the opinion of D.E. Sagimbayeva, in accordance with the specifics of the activity of a foreign language teacher, when the main function in the profession of a teacher of a foreign language is the communicative-teaching function, two main components of the professional competence of the foreign language teacher can be singled out [23]:

- professional-communicative competence;
- professional-methodological competence.

Both types of activity represent a deep synthesis of verbal and didactic-methodological actions, which are in different proportions to each other. Thus, a verbal component dominates in the professional-communicative activity, while in the professional-methodological a didactical-methodological component prevails.

U.T. Nurmanina in her study reveals the essence of the teacher's readiness to conduct a foreign language lesson. The significance that the author places in the notion of «readiness» is very close to the notion of «competence» [22]. The author follows the following logic that the concept of «readiness» expresses the person's orientation to professional activity [11]. Pedagogical readiness is interpreted by the researcher as psychological preparedness, as a stable characteristic of a person in activity, as an integral complex that includes motivational, intellectual and emotional changes that are adequate to the content and conditions of activity [20]. Thus, in the opinion of U.T. Nurmanalina, readiness for professional pedagogical activity can be represented as a synthesis of personal attitudes, profound professional knowledge, abilities, skills, positive motivation for the pedagogical profession, the dynamics of psychological processes, activity and autonomy in solving pedagogical tasks.

E.V. Kuzlyakina in her research considered professional communicative skills as a holistic, integrative education that includes culturological, psychological, pedagogical, methodological and linguistic components and serves to establish pedagogically expedient relationships and the organization on their basis of optimal personal and socially-oriented interaction to achieve cognitive, developmental, educational and educational tasks [19]. The structure of professional communicative skills is made up of general verbal skills (perceptive-analytical, prognostic-projective, productive, reflexive-corrective) and communicative skills that provide the projective, adaptive, organizational, motivational, monitoring and research functions of a foreign language teacher [12].

The key competences of the future teacher of a foreign language are considered in the study of O.O. Shalamova, among which the author singles out the following:

- socio-cultural competence, the content of which is intercultural interaction, language and speech development, mastering the culture of native and foreign languages;

- competence of personal self-improvement and self-development, which includes self-improvement, self-regulation and self-development; social, personal and activity reflections;

- informational-technological competence as mastering computer literacy for the purpose of searching and operative processing of necessary information; application of modern information technologies in the educational and cognitive activities of the future teacher of a foreign language [18].

According to A.N. Dakhin, professional competence of the teacher can have the following components: axiological, culturological, life-creative, moral-ethical, and civil.

The axiological component includes universal values that are selected, discussed, critically evaluated, appropriated and become a component of the spiritual world of a man, and sometimes alienated [13].

The cultural component contains various cultural areas in which the life activity of a person (academic, recreational, etc.) takes place; general cultural abilities necessary in professional activity; values and traditions of national culture and actions for their preservation, revival, reproduction.

The life-creative component is the ability to organize and live real events, the ability to apply technologies that occur in everyday life (functional literacy); readiness to change and improve the living conditions of life, the transformation of the micro-society [14].

Moral-aesthetic – the accumulation of living experience of emotionally saturated situations of humane behavior; the organization of charity activities, the manifestation of caring for others, tolerance for other people, adequate self-esteem.

Civil – participation in socially useful activities, manifestation of civic feelings, defending human rights and other situations that develop the experience of civil behavior [15].

A.N. Dakhin understands competence as a high level of professional knowledge and skills, refracted in the ways of professional activity. In the model of the teacher's professional competence, he includes such elements as:

General pedagogical culture: the manifestation of professional pedagogical, general cultural and personal qualities in the process of educational activity [30];

Socio-cultural qualities: high spirituality, civic-mindedness, humanity, erudition, activity and mobility [31];

General educational skills: designing and practical organization of activities; a combination of different conceptual schemes; use of information in the contextual version; determination of merits and demerits in the activity; analysis, reflection and improvement of their own methods; gnostic skills [16];

Personal qualities of the teacher: recognizing oneself as a developing subject, the culture of human interactions, recognizing learners as equals and as developing subjects of the educational process;

Personal life experience of the teacher;

Professional qualities of the teacher: knowledge of the subject, psychological and pedagogical competence, technological and functional literacy.

Thus, all researchers are united in their opinion that the teacher of the new formation is a spiritually developed, creative person, possessing professional skills, a pedagogical gift and a desire for obtaining new knowledge [17]. The personality of a modern teacher is viewed not as a simple sum of properties and characteristics, as traditionally described in qualifying characteristics of pedagogical specialties, but as an integral dynamic personality, the logical center and foundation of which is the personal motivational sphere that makes up social and professional position of the personality [29].

The level of modern requirements for teachers of foreign languages is reflected in the Concept of the Development of Foreign Language Education in the Republic of Kazakhstan and is aimed at ensuring:

1) continuity and consistency of the content of pedagogical education, oriented to foreign-language professional activity, achieved by a common target orientation, mutual consistency and continuity of educational standards, curricula and programs of different levels and stages of pedagogical education;

2) purposeful preparation of teaching staff for the foreign language teaching, differentiated by levels, stages, forms of instruction and types of educational institutions in the system of university and postgraduate education;

3) creation of a mechanism for updating the subjective, psychological, pedagogical and general cultural preparation of specialists [27];

4) preparation of a new generation of competent, highly educated, competitive foreign language teachers who creatively implement the National Concept for the Development of Foreign Language Education [28];

5) achievement of the level of foreign language training corresponding to international standard requirements [26];

6) convertibility of diplomas in the field of foreign language acquisition;

7) possibility of obtaining international certificates in foreign language acquisition;

8) cardinal processing of regulatory-managerial and educational-methodological documentation;

9) creating textbooks and educational-methodological complexes that meet the requirements of the new social procurement;

10) mastering new international standard methods and technologies for assessing the level of foreign language proficiency.

11) introduction of modern methods and technologies, including informational and computer, foreign language education [25].

12) maintenance of efficiency and quality of retraining and improvement of professional skill of working teachers, teaching staff in the conditions of modernization of foreign language education.

Results and discussion

Thus, the modern characteristic of the foreign language education given in this section allows us to formulate the main tendencies of foreign-language education, which are as follows:

– proficiency in one or several foreign languages is at present presupposed by not only economic, but more general educational points, as a factor of the overall political and cultural development of the individual [22];

– expansion of the subjective area «foreign language» to the level of «foreign language education» [24];

– methodological basis of foreign-language education is the cognitive-linguocultural methodology;

– the object of study is «linguoculture» as a methodologically basic category that synthesizes the «language-culture-personality», which reflects the goal-producing product as a formed «subject of intercultural communication» into an integral object of scientific research [19];

– intercultural and communicative competence is the object of formation of foreign-language education;

– the result of foreign-language education is a subject of intercultural communication [21];

– the system of assessing the formation of intercultural and communicative competence considers an internationally accepted system of controlling-assessment tasks;

– reconsideration of the strategic orientations of the foreign language education predetermined and the reconsideration of the methodological preparation of the foreign language teacher, which demands a teacher of a new formation [20].

Conclusion

Without denying the importance of traditional ways of mastering the language and culture, it is necessary to pay a special attention to the fact that in the new millennium, we should take

into account the current state of science and new technologies that enable us to effectively reflect and convey the facts and events of the present time [23]. In this regard, computer and multimedia approaches, the newest information and communication technologies, which allow to optimize the accumulation, fixation and transfer of cultural and linguistic information, acquire special significance for studying the languages and cultures of the peoples of the world.

References

- 1 Kulgildinova T.A., Zhumabekova G.B., Golovchun A.A., Eginisova A. Theory and practice professional competence formation of learners. Collective monograph. – „East West“ Association for Advances Studies and Higher Education. – Vienna, 2016. – 120 p.
- 2 Беспалько В.П. Слагаемые педагогической технологии. – М.: Педагогика, 1989. – 192 с.
- 3 Вербицкий, А. А. Активное обучение в высшей школе: контекстный подход / А.А. Вербицкий. – М.: Высш. шк., 1991.
- 4 Гершунский Б.С. К вопросу о сущности законов педагогики // Советская педагогика. – 1971.
- 5 Давыдов В. В. Теория развивающего обучения. – М., 1996.
- 6 Загвязинский В.И. Теория обучения. Современная интерпретация. – М.: 2001. – 192 с.
- 7 Хуторской А.В. Методология педагогики: Человеческообразный подход. – М.: Издательство «Эйдос»; Издательство Института образования человека, 2014. – 171 с.
- 8 Кунанбаева С.С. Современное иноязычное образование: методология и теории. – Алматы: Дом печати «Эдельвейс», 2005. – 264с.
- 9 Kotthoff, H.; Spencer-Oatey. Editors Introduction. Handbook of Intercultural Communication. Handbooks of applied linguistics. – 2007. – Vol. 7. – Mouton de Gruyter. – Pp. 9-12.
- 10 Kim, Y. Y. Intercultural Communication. The Handbook of Communication Science. – SAGE, 2009. – Pp. 453-470.
- 11 Thielmann, W. Power and Dominance in Intercultural Communication. Handbook of Intercultural Communication. Handbooks of applied linguistics. – 2007. – Vol. 7. Mouton de Gruyter. – Pp. 395-414.
- 12 Zegarac, V. A cognitive pragmatic perspective on communication and culture. Handbook of Intercultural Communication. Handbooks of applied linguistics. – 2007. – Vol. 7. Mouton de Gruyter. – Pp. 31-53.
- 13 Giles, H., Noels, K. A. Communication Accommodation in Intercultural Encounters // Readings in Intercultural Communication. Eds. Judith N. and Thomas K. Nakayama and Lisa A. Flores Martin. – Boston: McGraw Hill, 2002.
- 14 Hall, E. T. Beyond Culture. – Garden City: Doubleday, 1976.
- 15 Hymes, D. Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life // Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. Ed. J. and D. Hymes Gumperz. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972. – P.35-71.
- 16 Hofstede, G. Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind. – London; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1991.
- 17 Matsuda, M. J., Lawrence, C. R., Delgado, R., Crenshaw, K. W. Words That Wound: Critical Race Theory, Assaultive Speech, and the First Amendment. – Boulder, CO: Westview, 1993.
- 18 McIntosh, P. Reflections and Future Directions for Privilege Studies // Journal of Social Issues. – 2012. – P. 194–206.
- 19 Phinney, J. S. A Three-Stage Model of Ethnic Identity Development in Adolescence // Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities. – 1993. – N61. – P. 79.
- 20 Jandt, F. E. An Introduction to Intercultural Communication: Identities in a Global Community. – Sage Publications, Inc., 2012.
21. Kincaid, D. L. (1988). The convergence theory of intercultural communication // Theories in intercultural communication. – 1988. – Pp. 280–298.
22. Gudykunst, W., Kim, Y. Y. Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication. – New York: McGraw Hill, 2003.
23. Bohman, J. Practical Reason and Cultural Constraint. – Bourdieu: A Critical Reader, Oxford: Blackwell. 1999.
24. Collins, P. H. Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment. – Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990.
25. Scollon, R., Scollon, S. K. Intercultural communication : a discourse approach. – MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
26. Morgan C., Byram M. Teaching and Learning Language and Culture // Culture in Language Learning. – 1994. – Pp.5.
27. Gudykunst, W. B. Intercultural Communication Theories // Gudykunst, W. B. Cross-Cultural and Intercultural Communication, – 2003. – P.167–189.

28. Kim Y.Y. Cross-Cultural adaption: An integrative theory // Wiseman R.L. (Ed.) *Intercultural Communication Theory*. – 1995. – P.170 – 194.
29. Oetzel, J. G. Intercultural small groups: An effective decision-making theory // Wiseman, R. L. (ed.). *Intercultural communication theory*, 1995. – P. 247–270.
30. Wiseman, R. L. *Intercultural Communication Competence* // Gudykunst, W. B. (ed.), *Cross-Cultural and Intercultural Communication*. – 2003. – P. 191–208.
31. Lustig, M. W., Koester, J. *Intercultural competence: interpersonal communication across cultures*. – Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon, 2010.
32. McGuire, M., McDermott, S. Communication in assimilation, deviance, and alienation states // Kim Y.Y., Gudykunst W.B. (Eds.). *Cross-Cultural Adaption*. – 1988. – P. 90 – 105.

References

1. Bepalko V.P. (1989). *Slagaemye pedagogicheskoy tehnologii*. Moscow, Pedagogika, 192.
2. Bohman, J. (1999). *Practical Reason and Cultural Constraint*. In Shusterman R. (Ed.) *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell.
3. Collins, P.H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
4. Davyidov, V.V. (1996). *Teoriya razvivayushchego obucheniya*, Moscow.
5. Gershunskiy, B.S. (1971). *K voprosu o suschnosti zakonov pedagogiki*. Soviet pedagogy.
6. Giles, H. & Kimberly A. (2002). *Communication Accommodation in Intercultural Encounters*. Readings in Intercultural Communication. Boston: McGraw Hill.
7. Gudykunst, W. & Kim, Y. Y. (2003). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication*, 4th ed. New York: McGraw Hill.
8. Gudykunst, W. B. (2003). *Intercultural Communication Theories*. In: Gudykunst, William B (ed.). *Cross-Cultural and Intercultural Communication*, 167–189.
9. Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Garden City: Doubleday.
10. Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. London; New York: McGraw-Hill.
11. Hutorskoy, A.V. (2014). *Methodology of pedagogy: Human approach*. Moscow, Publishing house «Eidos»; Publishing house of the Institute of Human Education, 171.
12. Hymes, D. (1972). *Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life*. Directions In Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 35-71.
13. Jandt, F. E. (2012). *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication: Identities in a Global Community*. Sage Publications, Inc.
14. Kim, Y.Y. (1995). Cross-Cultural adaption: An integrative theory. In: Wiseman R.L. (Ed.) *Intercultural Communication Theory*, 170 – 194.
15. Kim, Y. Y. (2009). *Intercultural Communication*. The Handbook of Communication Science. SAGE, 453-470.
16. Kincaid, D. L. (1988). The convergence theory of intercultural communication. In Kim, Y. Y. & Gudykunst W. B. (Eds.) *Theories in intercultural communication*, 280–298.
17. Kotthoff, H., Spencer-Oatey, H. (2007). Editors Introduction. *Handbook of Intercultural Communication*. Handbooks of applied linguistics, 7. Mouton de Gruyter, 9-12.
18. Kulgildinova, T.A., Zhumabekova, G.B., Golovchun, A.A. & Eginisova, A. (2016). *Theory and practice professional competence formation of learners*. Collective monograph. Vienna, 120.
19. Kunanbaeva, S.S. (2005). *Modern foreign language education: methodology and theories*. Almaty, The House of Press «Edelweiss», 264.
20. Lustig, M. W., & Koester, J. (2010). *Intercultural competence: interpersonal communication across cultures*. Boston : Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
21. Matsuda, M. J., Lawrence C. R., Delgado R., & Crenshaw K. W. (1993). *Words That Wound: Critical Race Theory, Assaultive Speech, and the First Amendment*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
22. McGuire, M. & McDermott, S. (1988). Communication in assimilation, deviance, and alienation states. In: Kim Y.Y. & Gudykunst W.B. (Eds.). *Cross-Cultural Adaption*, 90 – 105.
23. McIntosh, P. (2012). Reflections and Future Directions for Privilege Studies. *Journal of Social Issues*. 68.1: 194–206.
24. Morgan, C. & Byram, M. (1994). *Teaching and Learning Language and Culture*. Culture in Language Learning. 5.
25. Oetzel, J. G. (1995). Intercultural small groups: An effective decision-making theory. In Wiseman, R. L. (ed.). *Intercultural communication theory*, 247–270.
26. Phinney, Jean S. “A Three-Stage Model of Ethnic Identity Development in Adolescence.” *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* 61 (1993): 79. Print.
27. Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. K. (2001). *Intercultural communication : a discourse approach*. MA : Blackwell Publishers.
28. Thielmann, Winfried (2007). *Power and Dominance in Intercultural Communication*. Handbook of Intercultural Communication. Handbooks of applied linguistics, 7. 395-414.
29. Verbitskiy, A. A. (1991) *Aktivnoe obuchenie v vysshney shkole: kontekst. Podhod*. Moscow, High School.

30 Wiseman, R. L. (2003). Intercultural Communication Competence. In: Gudykunst, W.B (ed.). Cross-Cultural and Intercultural Communication, 191–208.

31 Zagvyazinskiy, V.I. (2001). Learning theory. Modern interpretation. Moscow, 192.

32 Zegarac, V. (2007). A cognitive pragmatic perspective on communication and culture. Handbook of Intercultural Communication. Handbooks of applied linguistics, 7. 31-53.