
© L. M. KOZINA

Senior lecturer, Department of the English Language,
Institute of Philology and Journalism, Tyumen State University

lkozina@mail.ru

UDC 374:316.663.5

DRAMATIZATION ROLE PLAY AS A MEANS OF MULTICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN CROSS-CULTURAL DIALOGUE

SUMMARY. The article considers the cross-cultural dialogue as one of the pedagogical ways of multi-culturalism development, the actual quality of an individual in modern life. The cross-cultural dialogue is a powerful teaching tool for the education of new multi-cultural qualities of a person, because it develops only in the situation of clash of cultures and it always leads to the new sense meanings. The conflict between cultures in the cross-cultural dialogue is considered as the driving force of the dialogue leading to mutual understanding, and therefore to the formation of new personal meanings. In the proposed three-stage model of the cross-cultural dialogue organization, the aim of which is to begin a sense-building process and actualization of received meanings, the emphasis is given to the role game-dramatization. Role play-dramatization is one of the forms of teaching that encourages the formation of multiculturalism in the cross-cultural dialogue: empathy, tolerance, the ability to take a proactive stance.

KEY WORDS. Multi-culturalism, cross-cultural dialogue, role play-dramatization.

According to the Education Act 2013, the priority of the society and the state is to upbringing and educate a moral and spiritual personality “on the basis of the universal human and social-cultural values; to integrate it into the national, Russian and global culture”, and to develop the learners’ “worldview in accord with the contemporary level of the scientific progress” [1]. The modern society can be objectively characterized by the cultural diversity; so, personal integration into the world culture is impossible without an effective cross-cultural interaction. Though, one’s own cultural identity should be preserved, i.e. educationalists are to develop learners’ multiculturalism.

In spite of the fact that both Russian and foreign academicians have contributed a lot to the study of multiculturalism (O. V. Gukalenko, A. N. Dzhurinskiy, M. A. Manoylova, V. I. Matis, P. V. Sysoyev et al.), this concept has not yet been included either into dictionaries, or encyclopedias, and the researchers still argue about the nature of this notion.

For instance, V.I. Matis defines multiculturalism as the preservation and integration of personal cultural identity in the context of a multinational society which allows to form tolerant relationships between different nationalities and encourages cross-

cultural communication [2]. M.A. Manoylova treats multiculturalism in education as the cultural pluralism and disapproval of the national, religious, gender or age discrimination [3]. In fact, most definitions do not reveal those features of multiculturalism which are peculiar to the fields of parenting and education. Considering the abovementioned definitions, we would like to specify that **multiculturalism in education** means the creation of an environment and system of pedagogical activities in educational process meant to make a person adopt cultural pluralism and to develop the culture of cross-national communication while preserving one's own cultural identity.

While defining the notion of a "multicultural personality" researchers note such basic indicator of multiculturalism as the skill of intercultural dialog; besides they name some character traits pertaining to multiculturalism [4].

The majority of the studies related to multiculturalism belong to the field of foreign language acquisition and it is quite logical; according to S.G. Ter-Minasova, each foreign language lesson is a crossroads of cultures. N.D. Galskova, guided by Yu.S. Karaulov's conception of the language personality, introduced the notion of a "secondary language personality" which is synonymous to a multicultural personality. She defines it as "a number of personal capabilities to study foreign languages on the intercultural level, understood as an adequate interaction with representatives of other cultures" [5; 46].

Treating the notions of the "secondary language personality" and the "multicultural personality" as synonymous, we analyze this definition and conclude that a multicultural personality is an effective participant of the cross-cultural communication and as a consequence of the cross-cultural dialog, i.e. this is actually the cross-cultural dialog that makes a personality multicultural. Therefore, in order to raise a multicultural personality we need to teach one to engage in a cross-cultural dialog and thus the cross-cultural dialog in this case becomes not only the goal, but also the means (technology) of educating a multicultural personality.

With regard to the modern researches of multiculturalism (Yu.V. Agranat, N.D. Galskova, V.I. Matis, V.V. Safonova, V.P. Sysoyev), we define the notion of a multicultural personality as an effective participant of the cross-cultural communication possessing such traits as tolerance, empathy, active social position and ability to show good professional performance in a multicultural society, while preserving one's own cultural identity. These personality traits prepare man for a cross-cultural dialog. The cross-cultural dialog and multicultural personality are interdependent: the multicultural personality does not exist outside the cross-cultural dialog, and the cross-cultural dialog becomes impossible if its participants lack the qualities of multiculturalism; therefore, the cross-cultural dialog can become a means of education of a multicultural personality.

What makes it possible to consider the cross-cultural dialog as a powerful pedagogical tool of developing new multicultural qualities of a personality?

In the course of research the typical features of the cross-cultural dialog were established: it can develop only in a situation of the clash of cultures (this factor was

indicated by M.M. Bakhtin, V.S. Bibler, Yu.M. Lotman) [6] and, consequently, it always results in meaning-making. It is well-known that new meanings can design new qualities; in this research these are the qualities of a multicultural personality.

Most contemporary pedagogical investigations in the field of cross-cultural dialog ignore these significant and differential features of the cross-cultural dialog and focus on the idea of organizing “interaction” [7] and avoiding any conflict between cultures by means of meaning-making technologies [8].

Unlike the abovementioned investigations we treat the conflict between cultures in a cross-cultural dialog as the driving force of the dialog leading to mutual understanding and development of new personal meanings and qualities of a multicultural personality.

According to psychological studies (D.A. Leontyev, V.P. Zinchenko), the category of *understanding* is the basic category of comprehension and personal meaning-making. As far as the cross-cultural dialog is founded on *mutual understanding*, its participants guided by *understanding* evolve new *meanings* that enrich their previous experience. The meaning-making process is based on self-cognition, reflection and interpretation through the prism of one’s own life experience.

Consequently, multiculturalism (treated as meaning) can be formed as a result of comprehension of a new cultural content (text) which becomes accessible not only through a language, but also through the process of understanding, organized in pedagogical activity according to the levels of understanding. And it can be acquired as a new meaning by the subject of the cross-cultural dialog. Thus, the meaning turns into the objective and subject-matter of the educational activity aimed at developing a multicultural personality. It is also treated as the content of the educational process organized a cross-cultural dialog.

Thus, we define the **cross-cultural dialog** as a communicative situation of the clash of cultures. The participants of the situation achieve mutual understanding and enrichment with new personal meanings while interacting.

Having studied the mechanisms of meaning-making, described in psychology by D.A. Leontyev [9] and V.P. Zinchenko, in pedagogy by I.V. Abakumova and P.N. Ermakov and used in E.G. Belyakova’s research for the development of the integrative model of understanding [10], we have designed a three-stage model of a lesson based on the cross-cultural dialog with the implementation of various pedagogic techniques.

The first **cognitive-reflexive** stage is meant to identify students’ background knowledge on the issue in question, to activate their past experience and encourage reflection on the given topic.

The second **reflexive-interpretative** stage includes introduction of an authentic text, its analysis and interpretation by the participants of a dialog; reflection on the acquired cultural experience, and establishment of communicative, speech situations of “clashes” of cultures; situations of compassion (empathy).

The third **activity** stage presupposes primary implementation of new meanings in the form of practical professional activity through project work and written tasks – essays and compositions.

The offered three-stage lesson model allows to get the profound understanding of a cultural phenomenon represented in a text and to launch the processes of meaning-making. Dialog is a necessary condition for meaning-search through penetration into the conceptual field of an opponent. Therefore, each lesson stage corresponds to a definite understanding mechanism and has specially designed communicative-rhetoric situations encouraging understanding in order to launch reflection; these situations merge, though not linearly, as while doing consequent exercises to train a particular skill. Instead, they extend the level of understanding, form new levels of comprehension and submersion into a “stranger’s” mindset, interpretation, reflection, empathy, acceptance or rejection (we should remember that the intercultural dialog activates one’s social position and develops acceptance as well as the skill of saying “no”).

Communicative-rhetoric situations are designed with the help of the well-known methods and didactic techniques: problematic question tasks, authentic materials – texts (films, photographs, fiction and science fiction, journalistic articles), project tasks resulting in practical activities, training technologies, role plays and dramatizations.

This article focuses on the dramatization role play, as far as this pedagogic method seems underestimated both in theory and practice of education in spite of a big number of researches.

The methodological and psychological literature has shed some light on the functions of dramatization in the teaching process. They are motivational-encouraging (A. N. Leontyev, I. A. Zimnyaya et al.), educational, didactic (meant to teach to defend one’s point), orienting and compensatory. All the researchers note a favorable influence of the play on the development of a student’s personality traits and priority system. However, they miss a most important axiological function of the role play. They do not show the mechanism of the educational meaning of the dramatization role play for a student’s personality. The mechanism of the axiological influence is founded on the mechanisms of *understanding* since *solution of a problematic situation* is an indispensable element of any role play.

L.S. Vygotsky, D.B. Elkonin and others consider the play primarily as a way to discover the world and assert oneself in it. Dramatization allows to actualize the need of self-expression and this need depends on a person’s need to “form attitude to other people, oneself and the outside world; playing someone else’s role stirs up empathy, results in merging with a different personality and acting like someone else. All this allows to go beyond one’s own self, to enrich one’s experience and emotions” [11]. These are the goals we set when we want to develop new character traits of multiculturalism.

Such a role play was organized in 2012 with the students of Tyumen schools and gymnasiums (aged 13-17) in the summer camp “Sunrise” funded by Tyumen State University. The play was conducted within the topic “Human Rights”. There was a native speaker among the participants.

Topic: Human Rights.

Objective: to form respectful attitude to a strange culture, to develop tolerance, empathy, ability to defend one’s position and to present one’s own culture.

The dramatization role play was carried out at the third activity stage; the first two stages – cognitive-reflexive and reflexive-interpretative – served as preparatory and helped disclose the student’s background knowledge on the issue in question, activate their previous experience and launch the mechanisms of understanding and reflection. Therefore, the following questions were asked:

What do you know about human rights?

What human rights do you know and what is their essence?

Do you think that human rights are observed in your country?

At first, the students did not seem to be very interested in the topic, they believed it was not relevant for them: they knew about human rights (they named the basic ones) and in their opinion these rights were followed in their country. Then a discussion on the certain articles of the Declaration of Human Rights (freedom of information right, the right for privacy, the right for personal security) was organized. The participants shared the facts they knew, mostly from the mass media, and recalled the tragic event involving Princess Diana and military interventions in Yugoslavia; however they neither provided any relevant personal examples nor described events that happened in Russia.

The native speaker spoke out that on the whole human rights are observed in the USA, but to his mind the state (American, Russian and other) sometimes violates the rights of the citizens to get some benefits.

At this stage the mechanism of “understanding” through the reflection of the existing experience was launched.

The second interpretative-reflexive stage involved the analysis of an authentic text. The participants were to interpret the author’s text and to compare it to the experience they had, as well as to create communicative situations: “clash” of cultures – mutual understanding – new personal meaning.

The students were offered to watch a news report where the former captain of the English football team urged the fans from Asia and Africa not to visit the European Football Championship 2012 in Poland and Ukraine due to the reports about physical, verbal and psychological assaults of football fans and players of other ethnicities by Ukrainian and Polish fans. He recommended all black fans to stay home and watch football on TV.

The participants of the discussion were to comment on the situation and give advice to fans belonging to different ethnic groups.

The participants expressed their indignation at such behavior of fans and added that such an attitude hinders promotion and development of team sports, and also violates the rights of certain people. The majority supported the captain’s advice that it was safer for people of other ethnic groups to watch the championship on TV. When we “brought together” the general idea of human rights and the real fact from the video, the students admitted that it had never occurred to them that fans’ hooliganism not only violated the laws but also infringed the right of another person to attend the favorite game.

Being asked what would have happened if the championship had taken place in Russia, the students responded that such behavior of fans was also possible. While

combining the conceptual fields of the participants and the author of the authentic video report, Yulia M. said that in the first part of the conversation on human rights “we were thinking globally” and considered the issue from the standpoint of a state; whether it was violating human rights of the citizens; but it turned out that people can violate the rights of each other in everyday life. It concerns people of other ethnic groups, as well as ourselves and our families. The American participant announced that he was proud that a black person is the US President, since about 20 years ago it would have been absolutely impossible and he told us about the struggle of Afro-Americans in the USA for their rights in the 1960-70s. It is clear that the participants launched the mechanisms of reflection, understanding and personal comprehension of the real incident of violation of human rights.

The aim of the third activity stage is to actualize new multicultural meanings.

Situation: there was a plane crash with people of different religious beliefs and ethnicities on board. The reporters of a small local newspaper were first to come to the crash scene and made plenty of bloody photographs of the victims. It was a tough picture.

If they are the first to publish these photographs, their newspaper will get a huge profit and the reporters will get huge bonuses.

Instructions for the groups.

Group 1 – the newspaper and the reporters defend their right to publish the materials because the society has right to know, they refer to the freedom to receive and provide information.

Group 2 – relatives of the victims are against the publication as it will violate their right for personal freedom. Besides, there are Muslims in the photographs, and their religious belief forbids images of bareheaded people and of naked body parts.

Group 3 – observers and counselors of the European court of human rights with a right of advisory vote. They should work out and substantiate their decision.

Editor-in-chief – makes an independent decision about publishing the photographs.

During the role play there was a heated dispute between the parties; the main argument of the reporters concerned the profit of the newspaper and consequently the increase of their personal income. Konstantin P. declared directly, “You cannot get your relatives and children back and my children need to eat and study”. The human right for freedom of receiving information was also used as an argument; however, such a reference was rather formal.

The party of the relatives mainly referred to the article of the Declaration that proclaims the private life security; they considered death of their relatives to be intimate for each family; besides they referred to the article on the religious tolerance, because some photos violated religious, in particular Muslim, rules. Many spoke of the universal humane morality (this publication is “a trauma for the living people that money cannot heal”).

The observers and officials expressed their unanimous opinion (even though each participant had a word and offered specific arguments) after they listened to the both

parties. In order not to violate the human right for freedom of receiving information or the right for personal security, it was suggested to publish only the pictures of the overall view and avoid those depicting the cruel details, as Milena Y. put it, "bloodiness of the image will not add up to the authenticity of the information".

The editor-in-chief had the most difficult task. His speech was very serious in spite of the protesting shouts of his "colleague-reporters". He agreed with the opinion of the officials and observers to publish only the overall views of the crash scene. He explained it by the fact that the Declaration articles can not be violated; besides, taking into account the moral aspect of the issue, he agreed that cruelty and violence damage not only the psyche of the victims, but also ordinary readers and possibly children. He also promised to pay bonuses to the photographers.

After the role play the participants were asked to write an essay on the topic with the following task: "In the role play you played a part. In your essay express your real position, what decision you would personally make and what arguments you would offer. Describe your feelings during the decision making process".

In their essays the participants-reporters mainly wrote that at first they were against publishing the photographs, but since it was their role they tried hard to find convincing arguments for it. Aleksandr Z. wrote "It was very difficult for me to find good arguments for the publication, as in fact, I was against it. In that situation I didn't care about one's religion, the main thing was that that person suffered. I was felt ill at ease all the time". Christina P. wrote "My real standpoint completely differs from what I had to play, as I am convinced that it is immoral to make a profit out of people's grief. During the discussion I searched and found more arguments for the publication, tried to persuade the others, but I still did not manage to persuade myself. Now I feel embarrassed." It is obvious that most reporters sympathized with the victims of the tragedy; therefore, the behavior imposed on them by the role they had to play made them feel uncomfortable.

The "relatives" essays expressed similar positions; their opinion coincided with the task, but as some participants remarked during the conversation with the reporters their opponents "irritated" them and "made them nervous". Konstantin P. wrote "I believe that private life should remain private and not be revealed in public. Violation of human rights is impudent. Be respectful!"

Those who played the officials and observers wrote that initially their position was against the publication, but in the course of the discussion they heard arguments on professional activity of journalists and photographers, and that the public have right to know the truth, and that made them think that some photographs which showed overall view of the events can be published. After the play most of them felt satisfied with the decision of the editor-in-chief. The latter wrote that it was very difficult for him to make up his mind as he felt responsible for the whole situation, "I have never thought that it is so hard to be the boss and bear responsibility for myself and also for the others and their actions. As for me, I concluded that laws (and human rights are laws) can be quite contradictory, but we can always make concessions so that nobody's rights are infringed. I liked the play and I am pleased with my decision and next time I am also willing to take responsibility and make choice."

As one can see, the reflection which was launched at the beginning of the lesson when the students recalled their own experience, interpreted the authentic text of the film and combined conceptual fields during the role play resulted in a *meaningful generalization*. According to it, human rights can be violated not only by the governmental institutions, but also by some individuals, by their behavior in private and in public. Judging by the participants' opinions, it can be claimed that the role play allowed to actualize these meanings and the players concluded that, in spite of different positions, interests, confessions and inconsistency of laws, it is still possible to find solutions which would suit all the parties. At the beginning the students demonstrated formal knowledge of the articles of the Declaration of Human Rights without any personal concern for the topic under consideration, meanwhile at the end of the play they got really excited. This undoubtedly proves that the meanings we were trying to reveal have been decoded and can serve as a basis for developing such qualities of a multicultural personality as tolerance, empathy and ability to defend one's position.

Research findings

The development of multicultural personality traits is one of the priorities in the modern society. We treat the multicultural personality as a personality that is an effective participant of cross-cultural communication possessing such traits as tolerance, empathy, active social position and ability to show high professional performance in the multicultural society while preserving one's own cultural identity.

The cross-cultural dialog can be a didactic means to develop multiculturalism, since the latter is interpreted as a communicative situation of the clash of cultures aimed at mutual understanding and mutual enrichment of the students' conceptual fields. Consequently, the multicultural personality traits are being formed.

The dramatization role play due to its problematic character promotes meaningful generalization, actualization of new meanings and development of the multicultural traits, as a result of the reflection which was launched at the beginning of the class when the students recalled their own experience, interpreted the authentic film and combined their conceptual fields at the activity stage during the role play.

REFERENCES

1. Federal law on education 2013, Art. 17, item 1.2 URL: <http://nsportal.ru/blog/shkola/obshcheshkolnaya-tematika/09012013-vladimir-putin-podpisal-federalnyy-zakon-ob> (in Russian).
2. Matis, V.I. *Teorija i praktika razvitija nacional'noj shkoly v polikul'turnom obshhestve* (Avtoref. diss. dokt.) [The theory and practice of development of national school in multicultural society (Doct. Diss. thesis)]. Barnaul, 1999. 341 p. (in Russian).
3. Manojlova, M.A. Multicultural education in modern society. URL: <http://www.it-n.ru/attachment.aspx?id=908> (in Russian).
4. Agranat, Ju.V. *Formirovanie polikul'turnoj lichnosti budushhih specialistov social'noj sfery pri obuchenii inostrannomu jazyku v vuze* (Avtoref. diss. kand.) [Formation of multicultural

identities of future specialists in the social sphere for learning a foreign language in high school (Cand. Diss. thesis). 2009. (in Russian).

5. Gal'skova, N.D. *Sovremennaja metodika obuchenija inostrannym jazykam. Posobie dlja uchitelja* [Modern technique of training in foreign languages. Textbook for teachers]. Moscow, 2000. 165 p. (in Russian).

6. *Novejsnij filosofskij slovar'* [The latest philosophical dictionary] / Ed. by A.A. Gricanov. 1998. URL: <http://terme.ru/dictionary/175/word/%CF%CE%CD%C8%CC%C0%CD%C8%C5> (in Russian).

7. Novozhenina, E.V. *Stanovlenie partnerskih otnoshenij prepodavatelja i studentov v Vuze* (Avtoref. diss. kand.) [The formation of partnerships of teachers and students in high school (Cand. Diss. thesis)]. Ulyanovsk, 2008. (in Russian).

8. Stakanova, E.V. *Psichologicheskie osobennosti smyslovoj samoreguljicii studentov pri izuchenii inostrannogo jazyka kak smysloobrazujushhego konteksta* (Avtoref. diss. kand.) [Psychological characteristics of students' sense of self-control when learning a foreign language as a semantic context (Cand. Diss. thesis)]. Rostov an Don. 2006. (in Russian).

9. Leont'ev, D.A. *Psichologija smysla: priroda, stroenie i dinamika smyslovoj real'nosti* [Sense psychology: nature, structure and dynamics of semantic reality]. Moscow, 1999. (in Russian).

10. Beljakova, E.G. *Smysloobrazovanie v pedagogicheskom vzaimodejstvii. Monografija* [Smysloobrazovaniye in pedagogical interaction. Monograph]. Tyumen, 2008. (in Russian).

11. Samarich, V.V. *Dramatizacija kak sredstvo stanovlenija kommunikativnyh sposobnostej budushhih pedagogov* (Avtoref. diss. kand.) [Dramatization as means of formation of communicative abilities of future teachers (Cand. Diss. thesis)]. Stavropol, 2000. (in Russian).