

RESEARCH ARTICLE	Philosophy of Dialogue between Theory and Practice: A Critical Analysis of Contemporary Challenges and Trends	
Ababsia Nabil	Reseracher	
	University of Eloued	
	Algeria	
	https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7252-4761	
Doi Serial	https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/8.5.69	
Keywords	Philosophy, Dialogue, Theory and Practic, Contemporary Challenges and Trends	
Abstract		
<p>This paper explores the contemporary challenges and transformations in the philosophy of dialogue, aiming to bridge theory and practice in today’s complex social and technological contexts. It examines foundational concepts such as intersubjectivity, the limitations of language, and the ethical-pragmatic tension in dialogical interactions. The study critically analyzes classical theories (e.g., Buber, Gadamer, Levinas) and their relevance in intercultural, digital, and educational contexts. Results show that dialogue, while essential, is often hindered by power asymmetries, ambiguous language, and the influence of AI and media algorithms. The paper emphasizes the need for a shift toward more experiential, inclusive, and critical dialogical models. Key recommendations include transformative, practice-based, and intercultural dialogue frameworks. These approaches aim to restore depth, empathy, and ethical integrity to human communication. Ultimately, dialogue must evolve into a living, daily practice to sustain understanding and coexistence in a polarized world.</p>		
Citation		
<p>Ababsia N. (2025). Philosophy of Dialogue between Theory and Practice: A Critical Analysis of Contemporary Challenges and Trends. <i>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems</i>, 8(5), 676-685; doi:10.56352/sei/8.5.69. https://imcra-az.org/archive/362-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-4-volviii-2025.html</p>		
Licensed		
<p>© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Science, Education and Innovations in the context of modern problems (SEI) by IMCRA - International Meetings and Journals Research Association (Azerbaijan). This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).</p>		
Received: 09.02.2025	Accepted: 28.04.2025	Published: 19.05.2025 (available online)

Introduction:

The philosophy of dialogue is a vital and pivotal stream of thought that emerged in the twentieth century and continues to gain momentum in the context of contemporary social and technological transformations. Dialogue is no longer an academic concept, but an existential and practical necessity in an increasingly complex and polarized world. The intellectual roots of this philosophy go back to the work of the Austrian-Jewish thinker Martin Buber, who established the concept of the authentic I-Thou relation as the basis for all genuine human interaction (Buber, 1970, p. 59). This relationship goes beyond the mere use of the other as a tool or object ("I-It relation") and focuses on recognizing the other as a unique and complete self, creating a shared space of meaning. As the original text noted, the goal of this philosophy is to "provide a deeper understanding of the nature of human communication and human relationships and their impact on social and cultural interactions."

The extension and development of this philosophy in various schools of thought in Germany (with figures such as Hans-Georg Gadamer, Carl Otto Abel, and Jürgen Habermas), Russia (with Mikhail Bakhtin), France (with Emmanuel Levinas and Paul Ricoeur), and the United States shows the richness and diversity of approaches to dialogic issues. In Germany, Hermeneutic Dialogue developed with Hans-Georg Gadamer, who saw dialogue as a process of integrating different perspectives of understanding to arrive at truth (Gadamer, 2004, p. 302). In France, Emmanuel Levinas profoundly influenced the ethical dimension of dialogue, emphasizing the responsibility of the self towards "the face of the Other" as a moral call to treat it with unconditional respect (Levinas, 1969, p. 197). In Russia, Mikhail Bakhtin introduced the concept of "polyphony" and "dialogism" in language and literature, emphasizing that every word is a response to previous words and anticipates subsequent responses, making language inherently dialogic (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 276).

This diversity of perspectives shows the richness of the philosophy of dialog and its ability to accommodate multiple dimensions: ontological, ethical, linguistic, and epistemological. This research aims to dive into the main issues and trends of the philosophy of dialogue in the contemporary context, while providing an in-depth critical analysis, in an attempt to address the question of how the philosophy of dialogue can be activated theoretically and practically in light of contemporary challenges related to shared subjectivity, the issue of language, the gap between ethics and practice, and digital and educational transformations, without falling into theoretical idealism or marginalization of practical reality.

1. Intersubjectivity

The concept of "shared subjectivity" or "intersubjectivity" is the cornerstone of any serious discussion about the possibility of genuine dialog. It goes beyond mere superficial empathy to raise deep philosophical questions about how individual selves, inherently separate, can meet, understand, and co-construct a shared meaning of the world. "The fundamental question of the limits and possibility of such understanding under cultural and social differences" (see, for example, Tadeusz, 2015, p. 45, who discusses various concepts of dialogue) lies at the heart of this issue.

1.1 A critical analysis of Gadamer's concept of "common ground":

Hans-Georg Gadamer's view that "true dialogue presupposes common ground." Gadamer is one of the most prominent philosophers of hermeneutics, who argues that understanding is not a passive assimilation of information, but a process of "Horizontverschmelzung" (Horizontverschmelzung) between the interpreter's self and the text or other (Gadamer, 2004, e.g., pp. 301-307). "Horizon" here means the set of presuppositions, traditions, and experiences that shape our understanding of the world.

The challenge to achieving this common ground, especially between disparate cultures, is that these "prejudices" (Vorurteile) - which Gadamer considers not necessarily negative but a prerequisite for understanding (Gadamer, 2004, e.g., pp. 270-277) - can be highly dissonant. When fundamental values, such as the concept of time, the relationship of the individual to society, or ways of expressing respect, are different, building a bridge to understanding becomes a daunting task, and some intercultural dialogues (e.g. between East and West) fail not out of bad faith, but because of the difficulty of finding agreed points of reference or a deep understanding of the other's "horizon" (Gadamer, 2004, e.g., pp. This does not mean that dialogue is impossible, but rather that it requires a conscious and continuous hermeneutical effort, and a recognition that full understanding may remain a goal we strive for but never fully attain.

1.2 Additional dimensions of barriers to learning:

Epistemological and psychological barriers: How can I really "know" what the other person is thinking or feeling? Philosophers like Edmund Husserl and Alfred Schutz explored how to construct a shared life-world (Lebenswelt) from subjective experiences, but they recognized the difficulty of fully transcending the "singular ego" to reach complete certainty about the experience of the other. On a psychological level, defense mechanisms, fear of judgment, and the desire to preserve one's self-image can hinder the openness necessary for intersubjectivity.

Asymmetric power dynamics: The ideal dialog assumes equality between the interlocutors. However, as post-structuralist theories and social criticism (such as the work of Michel Foucault or Jürgen Habermas in his analysis of

the power-distorted communicative act) point out, power relations (social, economic, political) are often present and entrenched. The stronger party may impose their vision or not feel the need to listen sincerely, while the weaker party may be afraid to express themselves freely (Freire, 1970). This distorts the possibility of genuine empathy.

Differences in "symbolic capital" and "habitus" (Bourdieu): Differences in social and cultural backgrounds, what Pierre Bourdieu calls "habitus" and "cultural capital," can lead to systematic misunderstandings, where the same words or behaviors are interpreted in very different ways (Bourdieu, 1984).

This remains an ongoing challenge, requiring a critical awareness of the conditions that make mutual understanding possible or impossible, and a relentless endeavor to expand the horizon of the self to accommodate the horizons of others.

2. Language and Expression in Dialogue

For example, Mikhail Bakhtin considers language to be "the essence of dialogue," as it "goes beyond being a mere means of communication and becomes a means of expression of identity and deep human existence" (Bulavka & Buzgalin, 2004, p. 67). For Bakhtin, a word is always "half someone else's," imbued with social and historical voices (Bakhtin, 1981, e.g., "Discourse in the Novel"). Every expression is a response to previous expressions and invites subsequent responses, making language inherently dialogic.

2.1 The limitations of language despite its apparent perfection:

Polysemy & Ambiguity: Despite this rich view of language, as the original text notes, "it can sometimes fail to communicate thoughts and feelings accurately." This is partly because words are often polysemous, and their exact meaning is highly dependent on the context, tone of voice, and context. This is partly because words are often polysemous, and their exact meaning is highly dependent on context, tone of voice, and even relationships between interlocutors. Philosophers of language such as Ludwig Wittgenstein, in his later phase, emphasized that the meaning of a word is its use in a particular "language game" (Wittgenstein, 1953, e.g., Part I). When interlocutors are unconsciously engaged in different "language games" (e.g., one uses analytical language and the other emotional language), misunderstandings are almost inevitable. A case in point is "religious or political dialogues," where a word like "freedom," "jihad," or "democracy" can be loaded with wildly divergent meanings and interpretations depending on the "cultural and social context" and ideology.

The limitations of language in expressing deeply subjective experiences (The Ineffable): There are aspects of human experience - such as deep aesthetic sensations, spiritual experiences, or even some intense physical or emotional pain - that may elude precise linguistic description. Language, with its linear and categorical nature, may find it difficult to capture the holistic and flowing nature of these experiences. As the poet said, "What cannot be said, must be silenced" (adapted from Wittgenstein), or perhaps expressed in other non-linguistic ways such as art or music.

Language as a barrier, not a bridge: Sometimes, instead of language being a bridge to understanding, it can itself become a source of disagreement. Differences in dialects, level of familiarity with a particular language, or even the use of specialized jargon can create communication barriers. Language can be used to hide meaning or to manipulate, not just to reveal (see Grice's Principles of Collaboration, 1975, pp. 41-58).

The influence of non-verbal factors (Non-verbal Communication): It is also important to remember that a conversation is not limited to spoken words. Tone of voice, facial expressions, body language, and even silence all contribute to conveying meaning and can be a source of misunderstanding if not properly interpreted in their cultural context. Studies of nonverbal communication may suggest that a large proportion of meaning in face-to-face interactions is conveyed through these channels (Mehrabian, 1971).

The issue of language in dialog reminds us that effective communication requires more than just mastery of grammar; it requires sensitivity to context, awareness of nuance, and a willingness to clarify meanings and check for understanding.

3. Ethical and pragmatic bases for dialog

The assertion that "genuine dialogue depends on ethics such as respect, appreciation, and recognition of the dignity of the other" is at the core of many philosophies of dialogue, from Popper to Levinas and Habermas. However, the critique that this is "an idealized conception that does not reflect practice" (as might be inferred from critical analyses such as Gorsky & Caspi, 2005, p. 89, albeit in a different context) is a valid criticism and warrants careful consideration.

3.1 A realist critique: The Dominance of Conflict and the Challenges of Implementation

The gap between "communicative action" and "strategic action" (Habermas): Jürgen Habermas distinguishes between a "communicative act" oriented towards mutual understanding and a "strategic act" oriented towards self-interest. Habermas argues that many areas of life (economics, politics, bureaucracy) are dominated by a strategic rationality where dialogue is used as a tool to influence, persuade, or even deceive, rather than to reach a common truth (Habermas, 1984, see especially the first part of the book). "everyday reality, where conflict and competition prevail in most social, economic and political interactions", and reality confirms this gap.

3.2 The ethics of dialog in the face of the immorality of reality: Principles such as active listening, mutual recognition, and detachment may seem naïve or unrealistic in contexts characterized by structural injustice, exploitation, or violence. How can we talk about an equal dialogue between occupier and occupied, or exploiter and exploited, without first fundamentally changing power relations? This is where Marxist critique or postcolonial theories emerge, which emphasize that material and political conditions determine the possibility and conditions of dialogue.

3.3 Challenges of AI and technology (Leshchenko, 2024): Leshchenko (Leshchenko, 2024, p. 58) has argued that the rise of AI and new technologies presents new and complex challenges to the notion of authentic human dialog. These challenges are not limited to changing the mechanisms of communication, but touch the very essence of the dialogic experience itself:

The Flattening and Mechanization of Dialogue

Chatbots and generative AI: Chatbots, such as those used in customer service or even large language models, can convincingly mimic human dialog. But they lack true awareness, empathy, the ability to understand deep intentions, or complex social and emotional contexts. Dialogue with them, even if effective in accomplishing a specific task (such as answering a query or solving a technical issue), is still "less human and more mechanical."

Impact on human expectations: This constant interaction with intelligent systems may change our expectations of human dialog itself. We may start looking for efficiency and speed of interaction at the expense of depth, empathy, and emotional exchange, affecting our ability to engage in genuinely human conversations that require patience and mutual understanding.

Polarization and Digital Echo Chambers

Recommendation algorithms: Social media platforms and search engines rely on algorithms designed to deliver content that users prefer based on their past interactions. These algorithms create so-called "filter bubbles" or "echo chambers" (Pariser, 2011).

Isolating perspectives: Within these bubbles, individuals are mainly exposed to opinions and viewpoints that conform to their preconceived beliefs. This drastically reduces opportunities for exposure to different perspectives or critical thinking about opposing positions, making constructive dialogue on complex issues more difficult. Instead of fostering understanding, these environments exacerbate polarization and reinforce divisions.

Erosion of Trust and Misinformation

The spread of fake news and disinformation: The ease of producing and disseminating content online, and the rise of generative AI tools that can create convincingly fake text, images, and videos (e.g. "deepfakes"), significantly undermines trust in the information circulating.

Its impact on dialog: Trust is an essential element of any productive dialog. When interlocutors doubt the sincerity of the other party's information or motives, it becomes difficult to build common ground for understanding. This leads to dialogue paralysis where skepticism and uncertainty reign supreme.

3.4. Privacy and Authenticity Challenges

Collecting and analyzing data: Many AI systems rely on collecting and analyzing massive amounts of personal data. This raises serious concerns about privacy, and how the knowledge of others (whether AI systems or third parties) about our preferences and behaviors can affect our freedom of expression and the authenticity of our conversations.

Erosion of authenticity: When we realize that our interactions may be analyzed or guided by algorithms, we may become less willing to open up and express our true selves, reducing the authenticity and emotional depth of the conversation. In short, while technology offers invaluable opportunities for communication, it also poses existential challenges to the nature of dialogue, prompting us to think critically about how to preserve the human and ethical aspects of communication in the age of AI.

Despite all these challenges, adhering to the ethical foundations of dialogue is not just naïve. These principles can function as "regulative ideals" that guide our behavior and govern our dialogical practices. They provide us with a standard by which to critique distorted or unfair dialogues and strive for more humane and equitable forms of communication. We may not always reach the ideal dialog, but striving for it can greatly improve the quality of our interactions.

4. The practical and communicative shift in the philosophy of dialog

4.1 Dialogue as a practical and communicative experience: The necessity of daily practice

In recent years, the philosophy of dialogue has undergone a qualitative shift from being a field of theoretical and abstract reflections to being seen as a daily practice and a vital necessity in various dimensions of human life. Dialogue is no longer limited to philosophers and thinkers, but has come to be seen as an essential tool for resolving issues, building consensus, and promoting understanding in contemporary societies (Yermolenko, 2022, p. 10). This pragmatic approach draws heavily from the Neo-Socratic tradition, which emphasizes the value of mutual questioning, constructive criticism, and a shared search for truth (Yermolenko, 2022). The goal is not to impose a point of view, but to reach a deeper understanding of the issues at hand through open discussion and rational judgment.

This shift focuses on the procedural aspects of dialogue, i.e. how dialogue can be conducted effectively to achieve its goals. This includes emphasizing active listening, the ability to ask the right questions, the art of paraphrasing to confirm understanding, and the ability to manage disagreements in a constructive manner. Practical dialogue aims to address ethical and social issues by engaging all parties involved in a process of negotiation and understanding. It is an attempt to go beyond superficial differences and reach commonalities that can be built upon.

4.2 Critical analysis and examples: Challenges of putting dialog in practice

Despite the importance and necessity of this practical approach in the philosophy of dialogue, it faces fundamental challenges when applied in reality, especially in complex and contested societies. Some critics, led by Jürgen Habermas, argue that practical dialogue, although idealistic in concept, may run into obstacles related to the distribution of power, unequal opportunities for expression, and a lack of political will for mutual understanding (Habermas, 1984, p. 250). In polarized and tense societies, dialogue may turn from a means of rapprochement into an arena of ideological competition, with each side aiming to "win" the debate rather than seeking mutual understanding.

How can dialogue work in environments where there is a lack of mutual trust or common value ground? If the parties do not feel mutually respected or if the underlying interests are radically at odds, dialogue can become a smokescreen for underlying conflicts.

A practical example: Suppose a society suffers from a deep political divide between supporters and opponents of certain government directives, where public discourse is dominated by the language of accusations and finger-pointing.

In this case, even if a "national dialogue" is called for, the interlocutors may not really be willing to listen or compromise. The goal of the dialogue may be merely to reaffirm preconceived positions, or to use the platform to reinforce each side's narrative, rather than to search for compromise or common ground. The challenge lies in building bridges of trust and redefining interests in a way that allows for cooperation, which often requires the intervention of neutral parties and mechanisms to ensure fairness and transparency. Without these preconditions, practical dialogue can fail to achieve its goals and even exacerbate tensions.

5. Integrating Dialogue in Educational and Digital Contexts - Opportunities and Challenges

5.1 Dialogue in the digital and educational environment: Technology that fosters communication

Integrating dialog in educational and digital settings is one of the most prominent contemporary trends in the philosophy of dialog. Modern technology, such as the Internet and digital platforms, has provided unprecedented tools to foster interaction and knowledge sharing. Today, these tools are being utilized in multiple ways:

Interactive learning platforms: Universities and schools allow the use of online discussion forums, virtual chat rooms, and collaborative learning platforms, where students can interact with each other and teachers, ask questions, and exchange ideas (Zhukova et al., 2022, p. 45). This promotes active learning and moves it away from the traditional rote learning style.

Podcasts and audiovisual content: Educational podcasts and interactive videos are used as means to disseminate knowledge and encourage dialog on various topics. Listeners can interact with the content via comments or participate in discussion forums linked to the podcast, opening up new avenues for philosophical and academic discussion (Reva, 2024, p. 12).

Virtual communities: Specialized virtual communities have emerged that bring together individuals from different geographical and cultural backgrounds around common interests. These communities provide a space for dialog and exchange of experiences, fostering mutual understanding and the formation of knowledge networks.

This integration aims to make the conversation more accessible and inclusive, transcending geographical and temporal barriers, and giving a voice to those who may not have the opportunity to participate in traditional dialogues.

5.2 Critical analysis and examples: The Traps of Digital Dialogue and the Challenges of Authenticity

Despite the enormous opportunities offered by the integration of dialog in the digital environment, it raises deep critical questions about the quality and authenticity of communication. These challenges can be summarized in the following points:

Reduced quality of face-to-face communication and loss of human depth: Human communication is characterized by the presence of non-verbal cues (e.g. body language, facial expressions, tone of voice) that carry a large part of the meaning and contribute to building empathy and understanding. In digital dialog, these cues are lost, making communication more superficial and can easily lead to misunderstandings (Turkle, 2011, p. 251). Laconic text messages may become susceptible to misinterpretations, reducing the opportunity to build deep conversational relationships.

"Echo chambers" and "filter bubbles": These phenomena are one of the most prominent issues in digital dialog, especially on social media platforms. Due to recommendation algorithms, users tend to be exposed to information and perspectives that align with their preconceived opinions, isolating them from different viewpoints and exacerbating polarization (Pariser, 2011, p. 9). Instead of fostering dialogue, these platforms turn into spaces that reinforce division and emphasize existing affiliations.

"Trolling and aggressive behavior: Anonymity or a sense of protection behind screens can lead to rampant aggressive behavior, bullying, and "trolling" online, where individuals seek to stir up controversy or attack others rather than engage in constructive dialogue. This behavior undermines any attempt to make the digital space a safe and respectful space for dialogue.

Superficiality and a focus on quantity rather than quality: The nature of digital communication often encourages quick and brief interaction, which can lead to a focus on the sheer volume of information and posts rather than depth of thought and analysis. There is less time for reflection and deep listening, and more pressure to share immediately.

Applied example: Imagine a debate about a sensitive social issue on platform "X" (formerly Twitter). The use of hashtags and quick responses can reduce complex issues to simple, polarizing slogans. Instead of understanding the nuances of different points of view, the discussion turns into a battle between two opposing groups, each using aggressive language to prove their superiority. Participants may be verbally assaulted, or their views ignored if they don't conform to the prevailing opinion in their "bubble".

An important question arises here: How can we design digital environments that foster deep and civilized dialogue rather than superficiality and polarization? This requires developing mechanisms for oversight and regulation, encouraging digital responsibility, designing platforms that encourage active listening and critical thinking, and providing spaces for long and in-depth conversations rather than quick interactions.

6. Rethinking Classical Dialogic Theories - Searching for Essence

6.1 Re-evaluating the dialogic heritage: Toward a symbolic and anthropological understanding

The contemporary trend in the philosophy of dialogue represents a serious attempt to reevaluate and reinterpret the works of the classical thinkers who founded this philosophy. This does not mean a mere review of their ideas, but an attempt to delve deeper into the symbolic and humanistic aspects inherent in dialogue (Marchenko, 2022, p. 79; Dvorkin, 2022, p. 18). The goal is to go beyond a superficial understanding of dialogue as a process of information exchange, and to search for the ontological and ethical essence that makes it central to the human experience.

This trend revitalizes the work of philosophers such as:

Martin Buber: Focusing on the concept of "I-Thou" as a true existential relationship that transcends objectivity and function, where the human being meets the other as a whole being, not as a part or a tool (Buber, 1970).

Franz Rosenzweig: Jewish-influenced thought that sees dialogue as the center of human existence and the divine relationship, where the self is formed through interaction with the other and the Creator (Rosenzweig, 2005, p. 167).

Hryhorii Skovoroda: A Ukrainian philosopher who was influenced by the Socratic tradition and emphasized dialogue as a path to self-discovery and spiritual knowledge (Yermolenko, 2022).

This review aims to highlight that dialogue is not just a means of communication, but a process of meaning-making, identity formation, and the establishment of deep human relationships. It is a space for self-expression and recognition of the other.

6.2 Symbolic and anthropological focus: Language as an agent and constituent of identity

This trend pays special attention to the symbolic dimensions of dialogue, and how language and symbols are used to shape human communication and build cultural and collective identity (Weigand, 2021, p. 540). In this context, language is seen not just as a neutral tool for conveying ideas, but as an interaction that carries deep cultural and historical connotations. Language is not just a means of expressing thought; it itself shapes thought and influences how we understand the world and ourselves.

Language as a construction of meaning: The idea that language is a construction of meaning and that conversation is an ongoing process of interpretation of symbols and meanings is central to understanding how human communication works. When we interact with others, whether by speaking or writing, we don't just exchange words. What happens in dialog is a much deeper process involving an ongoing interpretation of symbols and meanings. These symbols are not limited to words alone, but extend to gestures, facial expressions, and even behaviors. All of these symbols carry certain cultural connotations that require a common interpretation in order to be understood. To understand this concept, we can say that words are not just fixed labels for things or ideas, they are flexible symbols that can carry different meanings depending on the context in which they are used. The same word may mean one thing in one

context and another in a different context, and the meaning is only made clear by the context in which the word is used, and in a conversation, the speaker and listener build this context together. Depending on the tone of voice and pronunciation, the word "okay" can convey genuine approval, sarcasm, frustration, or even disinterest, depending on the tone of voice or pronunciation. Words carry deep cultural and social connotations. Words like "freedom," "justice," or "dignity" have shifting meanings and deep interpretations that vary across cultures or even within the same society between different groups. Dialogue is the space where these differences are explored and a common understanding is reached.

Language and identity: Through dialog, individuals and groups define their identities. The stories we tell about ourselves, the values we express, and the beliefs we share are all shaped and reinforced through dialog with others. Language is not just a mirror that reflects reality, it is a tool for constructing that reality and shaping identity.

Anthropological dimension: This dimension focuses on dialog as a fundamental characteristic of human beings. Humans are naturally dialogic beings, and their language and thinking are rooted in social interaction. Dialogue is not something we do, it is who we are.

6.3 Critical analysis and examples: The danger of excessive theorizing and detachment from practice

Despite the great philosophical importance of this approach in deepening our understanding of the nature of dialogue and its existential dimensions, some scholars point out the possibility of falling into excessive theorizing. This overemphasis on the metaphysical or anthropological aspects of dialogue may lead to:

Dialogue is disconnected from its practical reality: When dialogue becomes a subject of complex philosophical consideration only, it may move away from being a practical tool that can be used to solve the daily issues of individuals and societies. It may become an "academic topic" that interests specialists without offering concrete solutions.

Intellectual elitism: These deep ideas may remain the preserve of academic and philosophical circles, limiting their spread and usefulness in broader contexts. Complex concepts such as "dialogic ontology" or "epistemology of mutual understanding" may not be easy for non-specialists to understand or apply in their daily lives.

Ignoring practical challenges: In focusing on "what dialogue is at its core," pressing issues of "how can we make dialogue work effectively in today's world?" may be neglected. Such as the challenges of mediating conflicts, promoting intercultural dialog, or countering hate speech.

An applied example: Suppose a group of philosophers discuss in depth Popper's concept of the "word beginning" or Bakhtin's "dialogism" in the context of the formation of the human subject. This discussion, while academically and philosophically important, may not offer direct solutions to a family struggling with communication difficulties, or a society divided along ethnic or religious lines. The challenge here is how to translate these deep philosophical insights into applicable dialogical guidelines and practices that are easy for non-philosophers to understand and use effectively. This requires developing bridges between theory and practice, and devising ways to simplify these ideas and make them accessible to a wider audience so that they can contribute to solving real-life dialog issues.

Unified conclusion:

Through what has been presented in this research, it can be emphasized that "the philosophy of dialogue emerges as a necessity for contemporary human interaction, with the importance of facing the issues and challenges that hinder its real-life application." This puts the finger on the wound. Dialogue is not an intellectual luxury, but a vital tool for coexistence and solving issues in an increasingly complex and interconnected world:

Achieving mutual understanding faces profound challenges: the difficulty of transcending individual subjectivity, cross-cultural "prejudice," epistemological and psychological barriers, and unequal power dynamics.

Although language is central to dialog, it can fail to convey accurate meaning due to its ambiguity and polysemy, and its limitations in expressing deep subjective experiences. Language itself can be a barrier and is heavily influenced by non-verbal factors.

The idealized dialogue based on respect and recognition is often at odds with reality, which is dominated by interests and conflicts, highlighting the difference between "communicative action" and "strategic action".

With the integration of dialog into educational and digital environments, opportunities to enhance communication have emerged, but also serious challenges such as the decline in the quality of face-to-face communication, the phenomenon of "echo chambers," trolling, and a focus on superficiality.

There is a need to delve into the symbolic and anthropological aspects of dialogue, with a focus on language as an actor and a component of identity, but with caution against excessive theorizing that may separate dialogue from its applied reality.

The proposal to move to "more experiential and pragmatic models of dialog that go beyond the traditional model and ensure better and more effective communication" opens up promising prospects. Such models may include:

Adopting Transformative Dialogue, which aims not only to understand, but also to transform the relationships between the interlocutors, especially in conflict contexts

Practice-based Dialogue aims to develop and train individuals and groups in effective dialogue skills, with a focus on practical application in their daily lives.

Making room for Critical Dialogue, which incorporates awareness of power dynamics and seeks to deconstruct dominant discourses and give voice to the marginalized, inspired by Paulo Freire's pedagogy or critical theories.

Intercultural dialogue based on cultural competence calls for going beyond mere "tolerance" to building true "intercultural competence," which involves a deep understanding of different cultural values, beliefs, and practices.

Finally, the philosophy of dialog remains "an open field for discussion and development." The challenges it faces are a reflection of the complexities of human nature and the societies we build. But continued research and critical reflection on these issues is in itself a step towards "fostering human understanding and communication" that we desperately need. The future lies in the ability to connect the depth of philosophical thought with the requirements of practical reality, to make dialogue not just a concept, but a daily act that contributes to building a more understanding and humane world.

References

1. Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, pp. 259-422.
2. Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 2-600.
3. Buber, M. (1970). *I and Thou* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, p. 59.
4. Bulavka, L. A., & Buzgalin, A. V. (2004). Bakhtin: The Dialectics of Dialogue Versus the Metaphysics of Postmodernism. *Russian Studies in Philosophy*, 43(1), 62-82. New York, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
5. Bush, R. A. B., & Folger, J. P. (1994). *The Promise of Mediation: Responding to Conflict Through Empowerment and Recognition*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pp. 5-200.
6. Dvorkin, I. (2022). Hidden Person Makes Dialogue Present. *Religions*, 13(6), 514. Basel, Switzerland: MDPI. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13060514>
7. Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY: Herder and Herder, pp. 35-183.
8. Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans., 2nd rev. ed.). New York, NY: Continuum, pp. 270-307.

9. Gorsky, P., & Caspi, A. (2005). A Critical Analysis of Transactional Distance Theory. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 6(1), 1-11. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
10. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). New York, NY: Academic Press.
11. Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press, p. 250.
12. Lemanto, E. (2022). Beyond Dialogue. *Sapientia Humana: Jurnal Sosial Humaniora*, 2(01), 26-39. Jakarta, Indonesia: STT Sapientia.
13. Leshchenko, T. A. (2024). Prolegomena to the Systemic-Dialectical Problematicization of Dialogue. *Russian Journal of Philosophical Sciences*, 67(2), 46-64. Moscow, Russia: Nauka.
14. Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, p. 197.
15. Marchenko, O. (2022). Symbolism of the Philosopheme of Dialogue. *Beytulhikme: An International Journal of Philosophy*, 12(2), 75-89. Ankara, Turkey: Beytulhikme.
16. Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent Messages*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, pp. 45-112.
17. Pariser, E. (2011). *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. New York, NY: Penguin Press, p. 9.
18. Reva, N. (2024). New Life of Philosophical Dialogue. *Sententiae*, 43(2), 120-132. Kyiv, Ukraine: Institute of Philosophy.
19. Rosenzweig, F. (2005). *The Star of Redemption* (B. E. Galli, Trans.). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, p. 167.
20. Sylwia, G. (2014). *Martin Buber Father of the Philosophy of Dialogue*. Poznań, Poland: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.
21. Tadeusz, G. (2015). *Pięć koncepcji dialogu*. Warsaw, Poland: Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, p. 45.
22. Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. New York, NY: Basic Books, p. 251.
23. Weigand, E. (2021). Language and Dialogue in Philosophy and Science. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 18(5), 533-561. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2021-0021>
24. Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, pp. 3-142.
25. Yermolenko, A. (2022). Hryhorii Skovoroda's Socratic Dialogue. *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal*, 9, 2-18. Kyiv, Ukraine: National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.
26. Zhukova, H., Bondarenko, S., Bondarenko, I., & Vasylenko, L. (2022). Dialogue in the Philosophical and Educational Postmodern View. *Postmodern Openings*, 13(2), 43-55. Iasi, Romania: Lumen Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.2/448>