



UDC 371.3:305.42
DOI: 10.58649/1694-8033-2026-1(125)-68-85

Received: 01.11.2025
Revised: 17.02.2026
Accepted: 19.03.2026

Transformation of the value orientations of humanities students in the process of engaging in intercultural interaction practices

Nurjan Sartbekova*

Doctor of Pedagogy, Professor
Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev
720026, 49 Razzakov Str., Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1632-2359>

Alina Motukeeva

Graduate Student
Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev
720026, 49 Razzakov Str., Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5252-908X>

Kanykei Karypova

Graduate Student
Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev
720026, 49 Razzakov Str., Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1914-5909>

Nazarbek Akylbek uulu

Graduate Student
Ala-Too International University
720048, 1/8 Ankara Str., Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4657-0101>

Nurzat Usupova

Graduate Student
Ala-Too International University
720048, 1/8 Ankara Str., Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-3477-0106>

Abstract. The study aimed to model how the value orientations of humanities students transform through intercultural interaction, drawing on speech and textual indicators. The research was designed as a phased mixed-methods study, combining the analysis of educational framework documents with paired “before/after” measurements based on a corpus of student texts, group discussion materials and questionnaire results. The empirical stage took place at Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev in Kyrgyzstan between January and September 2025. An operational three-level model of transformation was subsequently proposed, comprising values and attitudes, communicative skills, and knowledge and critical understanding. Changes were recorded through measurable speech parameters, such as the inclusivity of nominations, categorical judgements, reflexivity of statements, academic accuracy when working with sources, quality of cultural commentary, and the ability to analyse the pragmatics of a text rather than merely declare it. Quantitative analysis of paired texts normalised per 1,000 words showed that the frequency of inclusive linguistic units increased from 6.8 to 11.4, and the frequency of reflexive markers increased from 4.5 to 12.7. Meanwhile, the categorical index decreased from 14.2 to 7.9. In terms of skills, the frequency of argument reformulation episodes in discussions increased from 1.8

Suggested Citation:

Sartbekova, N., Motukeeva, A., Karypova, K., Akylbek uulu, N., & Usupova, N. (2026). Transformation of the value orientations of humanities students in the process of engaging in intercultural interaction practices. *Bulletin of the Jusup Balasagyn Kyrgyz National University*, 18(1), 68-85. doi: 10.58649/1694-8033-2026-1(125)-68-85.



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

*Corresponding author

to 4.6 per discussion, the quality of cultural commentary in translation tasks improved from an average of 2.6 to 4.1 out of 5, and the proportion of correctly formatted and functionally integrated references grew from 68% to 89%. There was also an improvement in the level of critical understanding: the proportion of correct identifications of discursive strategies increased from 58% to 81%; the proportion of accurate identifications of stereotypical frames increased from 43% to 74%; and the overall score for analysing the pragmatic function of a text increased from 2.1 to 4.3 points. Questionnaire measurements indicated growth in tolerance for ambiguity (from 3.12 to 3.89), responsibility in speech (from 3.34 to 4.21) and intercultural communicative confidence (from 3.28 to 3.94). The intensity of participation in intercultural activities was found to correlate positively with a reduction in categorical judgements. The study's practical significance lies in the potential application of the proposed system of speech indicators and the described model as tools for designing, evaluating and adjusting intercultural educational practices within humanities programmes. This could be used to develop criteria for assessing written work, peer assessment procedures and tasks that promote sustainable, value-based change

Keywords: speech; communication; internationalisation; inclusivity; discursive strategies; categorical judgements; tolerance for ambiguity

■ INTRODUCTION

Changes in higher education associated with increased intercultural contact have not only brought competencies to the fore but also transformed value orientations among humanities students. For philology in particular, this issue has become highly relevant, given that language functions as an object of analysis, a means of interpretation, and an instrument of social interaction. The need has arisen to empirically explain how intercultural interaction influences students' interpretative strategies, argumentative models and speech norms, and whether these changes can be measured through textual indicators. The issue of value transformation in international higher education was given conceptual backing in the work of D.K. Deardorff & E. Jones (2022), who defined intercultural competence as a structural component of university educational policy. The authors concluded that competence should encompass attitudes, knowledge, skills, and an internal readiness for interaction rather than being reduced to language training or mobility. They emphasised the need to integrate intercultural outcomes into learning descriptors. L. Edwards & B. Ritchie (2022) examined the role of the humanities in fostering critical thinking and revising worldviews, establishing that involving students in analysing complex sociocultural issues contributes to the evolution of their outlook and the development of cultural competence. They stressed that humanities courses can transform understanding of cultural difference.

S. Hackett *et al.* (2023) analysed the effectiveness of digital formats of cooperation. They identified statistically significant improvements in intercultural competence indicators among students involved in Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL). The study showed that a structured interaction design and shared outputs fostered empathy. It also showed that it fostered dialogical capacity. The authors distinguished between superficial online contact and integrated educational interaction. Drawing on humanities programmes, M.L. Bajec (2024) demonstrated that the systematic inclusion of intercultural tasks in the curriculum fosters a more flexible attitude towards cultural differences and enhances the capacity for reflection. Positive dynamics were observed in students' evaluations

of intercultural situations. T. Lähdesmäki & A.-K. Koistinen (2021) explored the link between intercultural dialogue, art, and the development of empathy, showing that artistic practices promote emotional engagement and awareness of otherness. Empathy was considered a key mechanism of intercultural understanding.

D. Liu *et al.* (2023) described the experience of transnational education in China, finding that intercultural dialogue prompted a reconsideration of learning expectations and communicative norms. Students reinterpreted their own cultural positions through interaction. G. Dosmanova *et al.* (2025) analysed the regional context of Central Asia, demonstrating that language shapes students' communicative culture and influences how respect and hierarchy are expressed. They identified differences in speech practices between Kazakh and Kyrgyz students, highlighting the importance of the linguistic environment in forming communicative norms. J. Ma (2025) examined the phenomenon of tolerance as a social category in humanities education, showing that tolerance development correlated with increased social responsibility among students. These findings emphasised the importance of the value dimension of learning. P. Shozimov (2023) presented an innovative interdisciplinary model of dialogue between European and Central Asian philosophical traditions, concluding that integrating different intellectual systems contributes to the formation of new approaches to humanities education and emphasises the importance of cultural dialogue.

Despite the substantial body of research on intercultural competence, the development of tolerance and empathy, and the revision of worldviews in higher education, changes in values have predominantly been documented through questionnaire responses, educational descriptors, and general behavioural characteristics. In academic discourse, insufficient attention has been given to operationalising such changes through speech and textual indicators that allow one to trace transformations in interpretative strategies, modes of judgement, and argumentative practices. Consequently, empirically grounded models that link intercultural interaction with measurable discursive manifestations of value shifts and enable their analysis as a process

of the structural reconfiguration of speech have remained underdeveloped. It was this gap that determined the need for a study combining the intercultural educational context with a philological analysis of discursive indicators. The study aimed to provide empirical evidence for a model of the transformation of value orientations among humanities students during intercultural interaction.

The aim of the research was to provide empirical substantiation for a model of the transformation of value orientations among humanities students during intercultural interaction. In accordance with this aim, the following objectives were set: to analyse international experience of integrating the intercultural dimension into humanities programmes and outline analytical parameters for assessing value outcomes; to operationalise and empirically verify indicators of transformation in attitudes, skills and critical understanding through quantitative measurement of speech indicators and questionnaire scales, as well as qualitative discursive analysis of interpretative strategies; and to reconstruct a generalised empirical model of transition from intercultural practice to the stabilisation of new value norms.

■ MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was designed as a phased, mixed-methods analysis of how value orientations change among humanities students through intercultural interaction, using speech and textual indicators. The study was conducted from January to September 2025. Geographically, the research combined two analytical perspectives:

1. An international perspective. This is through systematisation of global approaches to “internationalisation at home”. It also looks at COIL/virtual exchange and the measurement of values in education.

2. A local empirical perspective. This is based on Kyrgyzstan. It focuses on Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev.

Kyrgyzstan and Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev were selected because intercultural interaction at the university is institutional rather than episodic, embedded in formal and informal practices such as collective learning tasks, group discussions, translation exercises, and peer assessment. The sample comprised 124 undergraduate students, aged 18-24 (mean age 20.3), enrolled in philology, translation and communication programmes at Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev, including 71 women and 53 men. Ethnically, 68% were Kyrgyz, 14% were Kazakh, 10% were Turkish and 8% were from other ethnic groups. Proficiency in a second language (Turkish or English) ranged from B1 to C1 according to institutional testing, enabling correlation analysis with speech indicators. Second- to fourth-year students who participated in modules with an intercultural component and provided informed consent were included, while cases with incomplete “before/after” materials or irregular participation were excluded. Of the total sample, 98 students completed the full cycle of written and translation assignments

accompanied by cultural commentary. A further 112 students participated in questionnaires and group discussions, while 86 students completed analytical tasks involving the interpretation of media texts. Subgroups of 9-12 students were formed within each academic group (12 groups in total), ensuring comparable interaction intensity. In accordance with the Code of Ethics, approved by the American Sociological Association (1999), the ICC/ESOMAR International Code on Market, Opinion and Social Research and Data Analytics (2025) and the European Commission’s (2021) recommendations on ethics and data protection, the study adhered to the principles of voluntary participation, anonymity and confidentiality. All data were depersonalised and used exclusively in aggregated form.

The first stage focused on developing an analytical framework and identifying which “values/attitudes” were empirically accessible to philological analysis. A targeted analysis of framework documents and relevant scholarly sources defining educational descriptors of intercultural outcomes was conducted. The main theoretical basis was the Council of Europe (2020) Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture (RFCDC), which structures intercultural development as interaction across three interconnected dimensions: “values and attitudes”, “skills” and “knowledge and critical understanding”. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Learning Compass 2030 enabled alignment of recorded value shifts with educational outcomes. This is according to the OECD future of education and skills 2030 (OECD, 2019). The organisational and pedagogical parameters of intercultural interaction were interpreted in light of the virtual exchange approaches implemented within the Erasmus+ programme, which integrate cooperation into learning tasks and include structured interaction and reflective components (European Youth Portal, n.d.). This enabled the recording of speech changes to be linked to specific educational formats and evaluation criteria (European Commission, 2025). This stage was fundamental for the philological context because it allowed abstract categories (such as “openness”, “responsibility” and “tolerance for ambiguity”) to be transformed into measurable operational indicators in text and discourse.

The second stage involved case substantiation and the construction of the empirical research design at Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev in Kyrgyzstan. A case study approach was employed. This approach included embedded levels of analysis. These were institutional (organisation of intercultural practices), group (distribution of participation), and individual (changes in speech indicators in paired “before/after” products). The methodological relevance of Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev lay in the possibility of comparing interaction formats of varying intensity (number of contact sessions/hours), the presence or absence of reflective procedures (e.g., peer feedback and written comments) and the availability of stable learning products suitable for corpus analysis. The empirical corpus comprised several types of material. These

corresponded to three levels of operationalisation. Firstly, a collection of paired written works (e.g., “before/after” essays, analytical texts, reflective notes) was analysed using quantitative content analysis, normalised to 1,000 words. The assessment included an inclusivity index (frequency of appropriate nominations), a categorical index (frequency of absolute generalisations) and a reflexivity index (frequency of metacommunicative markers). This enabled the tracking of dynamics within individual authors. Secondly, group discussion materials (transcripts and protocols) were coded using a rubric of discursive micro-processes. The frequency of reformulation, clarification, and explanation of connotations per discussion was calculated, alongside a qualitative assessment of paraphrase types. Thirdly, translation and analytical tasks were evaluated using standardised scales: cultural commentary was rated on a five-point scale for addressee, context, and translation strategy, while media text analysis was assessed based on the percentage of correct identification of discursive strategies and a five-point pragmatic analysis scale. Fourthly, questionnaires on a five-point Likert scale in a “before/after” design were used to measure tolerance for ambiguity, responsibility in speech and communicative confidence. This questionnaire was adapted from the RFCDC and from instruments by N. Guillén-Yparrea & M.S. Ramírez-Montoya (2023) to ensure correspondence between the questionnaire scales and speech indicators.

At the third stage, the quantitative coding of textual indicators was carried out with normalisation per 1,000 words, using NVivo 14 and a predefined codebook. Inclusive nominations included: “different groups” and “members of the community” are examples of categorical markers. “Always”, “everyone”, “without doubt” – these are reflexive markers. Expressions such as “probably”, “it may be assumed” and “depending on the context” were used. Inter-coder reliability, assessed on a 20% subsample, was $\kappa = 0.82$, confirming coding consistency. Inclusivity was operationalised as the frequency of neutral/correct nominations and markers of equality/non-exclusion, while categoricity was operationalised as the frequency of absolute quantifiers and markers of unqualified assertion. Reflexivity was operationalised as the frequency of meta-communicative and modal markers indicating the limits of knowledge and alternative interpretations. Episodes of paraphrasing in discussions were additionally coded based on signal markers and a comparison of primary and secondary argument versions. To test the dynamics, paired t-tests for dependent samples were applied when normality was assumed, and Wilcoxon tests were applied when normality was violated. Correlations between participation intensity (the total number of audio-recorded and transcribed sessions, averaging 18-36 hours per student per semester) and

index changes were determined using Pearson or Spearman coefficients. The level of significance was set at $p < 0.001$, adjusted for multiple comparisons, and practical significance was assessed using Cohen's d , corresponding to medium and large effects ($d = 0.64-1.12$). This procedure was justified by the need to distinguish systematic shifts from random fluctuations. It was also necessary to preserve interpretability for philological analysis.

In the final stage, analytical triangulation of the results (corpus indicators, discursive analysis and questionnaires) was undertaken to identify the risks involved in implementing intercultural practices at Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev. These risks were identified as the formalisation of activities, linguistic asymmetry, unequal participation in discussions, and superficial digital contact lacking reflective procedures. These risks were considered factors that disrupt the transition from interaction to reflection, thereby limiting the establishment of new interpretative norms. The result was the creation of an empirical model of transformation, assembled as a series of stages, each with its own speech indicators and effects that could be checked, from small interactions to the growth of responsible, contextualised speech.

■ RESULTS

Global experience and current trends in transforming humanities students' value orientations through intercultural interaction

In higher education, intercultural interaction is increasingly viewed not as an additional aspect of learning, but as a means of achieving measurable outcomes that encompass not only knowledge but also students' attitudes, values, and responsible speech practices. In the humanities, language functions as an object of study, an instrument for interpreting cultural meanings and a mechanism of social interaction. A notable shift is that intercultural outcomes are now being pursued not only through physical mobility, but also by revising course content and pedagogy for all students. The logic behind this approach is described by the terms “internationalisation at home” and “internationalisation of the curriculum”. These terms refer to the deliberate incorporation of intercultural dimensions across various aspects of campus learning, including learning tasks, assessments, academic communication norms, and collaborative practices among students (Gosling & Yang, 2022; Zadravec, 2025). In such cases, it is not the international events themselves that matter, but how universities translate them into learning outcomes and assessment tools (e.g., competence descriptors and portfolios). For philology programmes, the internationalisation of the curriculum has specific entry points (Table 1).

Table 1. Entry points for integrating the intercultural dimension into an internationalised curriculum in philology programmes

Integration area	What is internationalised in courses	Typical learning products/tasks	Expected value-competence outcome
Language-culture-identity	Analysis of the links between linguistic forms and cultural norms, identity and social stratification	Analytical essay on language ideology; comparative analysis of language policies; case studies of discursive conflicts	Development of a critical stance towards the “neutrality” of language; responsibility for naming and meaning-making

Table 1. Continued

Integration area	What is internationalised in courses	Typical learning products/tasks	Expected value-competence outcome
Critical reading	Interpretation of texts from different cultural traditions with a focus on the speaker's position and cultural assumptions	Annotated reading; comparative interpretations; reflective notes on the reader's "blind spots"	Tolerance for a plurality of interpretations; capacity for reflection and dialogue
Media discourse analysis and media literacy	Recognising manipulative strategies; assessing credibility and the ethics of public speech	Critical analysis of media texts; fact-checking; reconstruction of discursive frames in news/social media	Greater responsibility in speech; resilience to manipulation; ethical standards of communication
Translation/mediation	Translation as cultural interpretation: conveying meanings for another audience with regard to context	Tasks involving cultural commentary on translation; paraphrase and adaptation for different addressees; mediation scenarios in conflicts of meaning	Empathic orientation towards the addressee; ethical responsibility for transferring meaning; development of plurilingual flexibility

Source: compiled by the authors based on A.J. Liddicoat & M. Derivry-Plard (2021), M. Rückl (2024)

Designing the curriculum in this way enables transforming intercultural interaction from an incidental aspect of learning into a clearly managed didactic process. Each area provides opportunities for students to develop subject knowledge and rules of interpretation and communication in situations of cultural difference. In the philological context, it is crucial that changes in speech practices can be measured, such as the manner of argumentation, the appropriateness of terminology, and attention to context and addressee. To avoid reducing this logic to mere declarations, universities in European countries use competence frameworks that describe value-related outcomes in the language of educational descriptors. One such framework is the RFCDC by Council of Europe (2020), which organises competences into four categories: values, attitudes, skills, and knowledge and critical understanding. This means that changes can be registered not as abstract "improvements" but as shifts in specific indicators (e.g., respect for human dignity, openness to cultural otherness, critical understanding of language as a bearer of power).

Following the sharp rise of online formats in higher education, the models of virtual exchange and COIL have become widespread – organised collaborative work between students from different countries in a digital environment (joint projects, seminars, debates, peer assessment of texts, partner learning). Erasmus+ virtual exchanges documentation (European Youth Portal, n.d.) emphasises that such exchanges are "person-to-person" online activities aimed at intercultural dialogue and the development of soft skills, but they do not fully replace physical mobility; rather, they reproduce some of its effects and provide access for those who cannot travel. Research evidence on COIL/virtual exchange shows measurable changes in specific components of intercultural competence and communicative practices. In particular, studies of COIL effectiveness (measuring intercultural competence) report statistically significant shifts in relevant indicators among groups involved in COIL compared with control groups (Chaisiri, 2025; Marsee & Hoyos, 2025). In the philological context, virtual exchange provides a setting for real communicative contact and learning through interaction: students must negotiate meaning, explain cultural connotations, edit texts for a different audience, agree on discussion rules, and manage

referencing practices. These micro-processes are potential mechanisms for transforming attitudes, for example tolerance for ambiguity, readiness to consider different interpretations, and the development of empathic listening. A related strand is intercultural digital literacy within humanities education. A systematic review on integrating media and information literacy (MIL) into curricula indicates that MIL is treated as a condition for developing critical, responsible citizenship and the ability to work with information in the public sphere (Rojas-Estrada *et al.*, 2024). For humanities students, this is directly linked to the ethics of interpreting texts and discourses and to norms of argumentation.

Another trend is the shift from rhetoric about values towards describing them as educational outcomes. The OECD's (2019) Learning Compass 2030 framework defines "values and orientations" as principles and beliefs that influence judgements and actions and are connected with wellbeing and responsibility. These components are proposed to be considered alongside knowledge and skills. For philological researchers, it is now methodologically acceptable to measure not only language skills, but also attitudes towards difference, willingness to comply with the ethical norms of academic communication and responsibility in public speech, through questionnaires, situational tasks, analysis of written work and discursive markers. Meanwhile, institutional programmes (e.g., Erasmus+ 2021-2027) explicitly link learning mobility and blended formats with developing social and intercultural competencies, critical thinking, and media literacy (European Commission, 2025). This provides a framework for viewing intercultural practices as a tool for cultivating civic responsibility and human rights within the educational context.

In order to substantiate changes in value orientations, it is advisable to distinguish at least three analytical domains clearly: (1) values/attitudes; (2) interaction skills; and (3) knowledge and critical understanding. These domains manifest in speech practices (Table 2). For philology, this is vital, because it's through text that values and knowledge become apparent – in how a student argues, cites, marks the limits of their own knowledge, reproduces or challenges stereotypes, and chooses strategies for naming and describing the "other".

Table 2. Analytical model for operationalising the transformation of value orientations in philology programmes

Level	Operational components	Examples of indicators in philological data
1. Values/ attitudes	Respect for cultural difference; non-discrimination; responsibility for words/speech; readiness for dialogue	Appropriateness of group nominations; absence of dehumanising markers; recognition of multiple interpretations; reflexive markers (“I assume...”, “another reading may be possible...”)
2. Skills	Intercultural communication; mediation/intermediation; academic writing according to intercultural standards	Ability to paraphrase for another audience; negotiation of meaning; compliance with citation/paraphrase norms; source-based argumentation
3. Knowledge and critical understanding	Language ideology; cultural codes; stereotypes; discourse of power	Ability to identify a text’s “hidden” assumptions; distinguishing facts from evaluations; analysis of pragmatics, roles and speaker positions; critical discourse analysis of media fragments

Source: compiled by the authors based on Council of Europe (2020), N. Guillén-Yparrea & M.S. Ramírez-Montoya (2023)

The presented model offers a structured approach to measuring changes arising from intercultural educational practices. Its three-level structure ensures methodological alignment between the theoretical frameworks of intercultural competence and students’ actual learning outcomes. It also provides a foundation for the development of text-coding instruments, assessment criteria

for written work, and analysis procedures for classroom discussions. In a research context, it enables the link between institutional practices and actual changes in students’ linguistic behaviour and interpretative strategies to be established. Analysis of institutional practices should not only consider declared aims, but also typical risks (Table 3).

Table 3. Typical risks in institutional implementation of intercultural practices in higher education and their analytical indicators

No.	Type of risk	Nature of the problem	Practical manifestations (signs of formalisation/constraint)	Analytical indicators for research
1	Formal internationalisation	International activity does not translate into course content and learning outcomes	Reporting on agreements, events and mobility without changes to syllabi; absence of intercultural learning outcomes; absence of assessment criteria for dialogue, mediation, reflection	Syllabus analysis (presence of intercultural outcomes); review of assessment criteria; presence of reflective tasks (journals, portfolios, peer feedback); ratio of event-based formats to curricular change
2	Inequality of access and language barrier	Limited access to mobility and online formats due to resource, language or organisational factors; symbolic exclusion of certain groups	Low participation by students with lower language proficiency; domination of certain groups in discussions; lack of language support; limited digital infrastructure	Analysis of programme participant composition; language proficiency levels; availability of tutoring/language centres; assessment of participation structure in group discussions; availability of technical resources
3	Risks of the digital format (superficial contact)	COIL/virtual exchange formats implemented without deep collaboration and reflection	Short presentations without a joint product; no peer assessment; minimal reflection; formalistic completion of tasks	Course design analysis (joint projects, peer review, reflective components); task types; duration and frequency of interaction; ways of assessing collaboration

Source: compiled by the authors based on E.G. Rojas-Estrada et al. (2024), M.V. Soulé et al. (2025), European Youth Portal (n.d.)

The above summarises the key institutional risks that could diminish the transformative potential of intercultural educational practices. The difference between declarative “internationalness” and genuine integration of the intercultural component into the learning process can be systematised. The proposed indicators encourage researchers to examine not only quantitative participation metrics, but also the qualitative characteristics of learning design and interaction structures. This allows different formats (physical mobility, COIL and internal internationalisation) to be compared in terms of their impact on substantive educational outcomes.

Empirical dynamics of speech-based transformation of value orientations

Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev is an illustrative case for documenting and explaining transformations

in the value orientations of humanities students, as intercultural interaction is institutionally structured and regularly reproduced across curricular and extracurricular practices. In this context, the empirical framework assumes that shifts in values and attitudes among humanities students can be most reliably observed not through explicit statements “about attitudes”, but through speech indicators. These indicators include the ways in which social groups are named, the modality of judgements, techniques of contextualisation, the accuracy of referencing, and the readiness to acknowledge a plurality of interpretations in texts and discussions. This approach is consistent with the logic of “internationalisation at home”. Here the intercultural dimension is not reduced to mobility. It is embedded in the formal and informal programme. This includes learning tasks, assessment, rules of academic communication and collaborative projects.

The study documented the transformation of humanities students' value orientations through shifts in speech practices, academic writing, and interpretative strategies in intercultural interaction. The analytical framework was based on a three-level model (values/attitudes, skills, and knowledge and critical understanding), with each level operationalised through a set of indicators that could be verified quantitatively and qualitatively. This approach meant that it was possible to avoid generalisations such as "tolerance increased" without any real evidence, and instead to link change to specific textual and discursive parameters. These included choices about nominations, the way judgments were made, how often reflexive markers were used, the structure of argumentation, and practices for working with sources. In terms of values and attitudes, the main findings related to the dynamics of inclusivity and ethical sensitivity in speech. In the corpus of written work and group discussion materials, there was a tendency towards an expanded repertoire of inclusive vocabulary and more cautious references to social groups. In the "after" texts, neutral and contextualised group labels appeared more often. They appeared in place of generalising tags. There was an increase in constructions that mark respect for the addressee. There was also an increase in constructions that mark the right to another perspective. On average across the sample, quantitative counts showed an increase in the frequency of inclusive units from 6.8 to 11.4 per 1,000 words ($\Delta = +4.6$; $p < 0.001$). The greatest increase was observed among students who participated in projects with clearly specified rules for peer assessment and text editing (peer feedback). In this subgroup, the indicator increased from 6.6 to 12.3 per 1,000 words ($\Delta = +5.7$). By contrast, in the subgroup without systematic peer feedback, it increased from 6.9 to 10.0 ($\Delta = +3.1$).

A second indicator at the attitude level was a reduction in categorical formulations. In the "before" texts, constructions with a high degree of generalisation and essentialisation were commonplace ("they always...", "this culture is...", "they do things like this..."), with no specification of context, source or limits of validity. Statements with limiting modifiers such as "in certain situations", "in some cases", "in particular practices" and "depending on the context" became more prevalent in the "after" texts, while conditional and modal means reduced the use of categorical language. The study operationalised categoricity through the frequency of absolute quantifiers ("always/never/all/no one"), markers of unqualified assertion ("it is obvious that...", "without doubt..."), and syntactic structures that do not allow an alternative reading. A comparison of paired texts revealed a decline in categoricity from 14.2 to 7.9 per 1,000 words ($\Delta = -6.3$; $p < 0.001$). Differences between groups with different levels of intercultural interaction (number of contact sessions/hours) were statistically significant ($p < 0.01$).

A third indicator of value shifts was an increase in the use of reflexive markers, which capture a readiness to acknowledge the limits of one's knowledge and alternative

interpretations. These markers included metacommunicative formulae such as "I assume...", "it may be interpreted differently...", "this requires clarification...", "different positions are possible on this issue...". Modal adverbs such as "probably", "possibly", and "largely" were also used, as well as references to conditions of interpretation ("if we proceed from...", "given the available data..."). In paired essays and reflective notes, the number of reflexive markers increased from 4.5 to 12.7 per 1,000 words ($\Delta = +8.2$; $p < 0.001$) and correlated with argument quality. This result is important for philological analysis as reflexivity does not appear at the level of declared values, but rather in the organisation of the text – i.e., in the choice of modality, the composition of the argument and how another position is presented.

At the skills level, the results showed that a transformation in attitudes is accompanied by the development of concrete communication abilities. Firstly, students demonstrated an increased capacity to reformulate an argument, adapting a message for another audience without simplifying it to the point of losing its meaning. During group discussions and peer assessments of texts, students more frequently used paraphrasing as a strategy to achieve mutual understanding. Rather than repeating their thesis unchanged, they clarified it using different lexical and syntactic means, introduced explanatory components or replaced potentially contentious terms with neutral ones. This skill involved coding reformulation episodes in debate transcripts (e.g., "that is", "in other words", "to paraphrase", "what I mean is...") and comparing the primary and secondary versions of the argument. The number of such episodes per discussion increased from 1.8 to 4.6 ($\Delta = +2.8$). Qualitatively, paraphrasing shifted from a superficial 'repetition in other words' to an explanatory form that took account of cultural connotations and potential sources of misunderstanding.

A second skill involved assessing the adequacy of cultural commentary in translation tasks. During the "before" phase, commentary often remained at the level of a dictionary definition or direct explanation of a single word. In the "after" phase, there was a tendency towards more pragmatic commentary, which explained not only the denotative meaning but also the social connotations, stylistic register, potential implicatures, and the risks involved in inaccurately transferring an item into another cultural context. An increase in the integral indicator of cultural commentary quality was recorded, rising from 2.6 to 4.1 points on a five-point scale ($\Delta = +1.5$; $p < 0.001$). Students who, in parallel, completed tasks analysing discursive conflicts in the media demonstrated the most stable growth. A third skill was accurate citation and paraphrasing. In the "before" phase, problems such as overly long quotations without analytical framing, formal referencing without connection to the argument and insufficiently transparent paraphrasing were observed. In the "after" phase, the proportion of correct references increased, while the number of cases of "unattributed" reformulation decreased. The

assessment used a rubric including the following four criteria: (1) the presence of a source; (2) the correct formatting of references; (3) alignment between the quotation and the stated thesis; (4) the quality with which the source was integrated into the argument (i.e., explanation, interpretation or critical comment). The integral indicator of academic accuracy (the proportion of correctly formatted and functionally integrated references) increased from 68% to 89% ($\Delta = +21$ percentage points; $p < 0.001$).

In terms of knowledge and critical understanding, key results included an increased ability to identify discursive strategies, detect stereotypical frames, and analyse text pragmatics. In analytical essays and discussions of media texts, students more frequently identified and differentiated between strategies for legitimising a position, such as appeals to authority, tradition, or common sense, as well as markers of polarisation, such as “us/them”, generalising techniques, and emotive-evaluative intensifiers. The identification of discursive strategies was assessed based on the number of correctly recognised devices in a given excerpt, as well as the ability to explain their function. The proportion of correct identifications increased from 58% to 81% ($\Delta = +23$ percentage points; $p < 0.001$). In the “before” phase, detection of stereotypical frames often remained at the level of identifying their presence, without analysing how they are reproduced textually. In the “after” phase, students more often: (a) distinguished between stereotypes and empirical facts; (b) described the lexical and syntactic features that convey generalisation; and (c) provided context (e.g., who is speaking, in what situation, and for what purpose). The proportion of correct identifications of stereotypical frames increased from 43% to 74% ($\Delta = +31$ percentage points; $p < 0.001$). In terms of pragmatic analysis, attention to the addressee, intention, and speech situation increased, with students more often considering genre, platform, probable audience expectations, and the difference between the literal meaning and the pragmatic effect. One indicator of this change was the rise in cases in which the analysis included the chain “linguistic device $\rightarrow$ pragmatic function $\rightarrow$ possible social consequence”. For the final task, the mean score on a five-point scale increased from 2.1 to 4.3 ($\Delta = +2.2$; $p < 0.001$), which was directly linked to taking responsibility for words as a value orientation.

The quantitative questionnaire results confirmed shifts consistent with the textual indicators. An increase of $\Delta = +0.77$ was recorded on the tolerance for ambiguity scale (from 3.12 to 3.89); an increase of $\Delta = +0.87$ was recorded on the responsibility in speech scale (from 3.34 to 4.21); and an increase of $\Delta = +0.66$ was recorded on the intercultural communicative confidence scale (from 3.28 to 3.94), with $p < 0.001$ for paired comparisons. These quantitative shifts were not regarded as independent “psychological changes”, but rather as manifestations of discourse: increased responsibility in speech was accompanied by an increase in the frequency of reflexive markers and correct references in writing; increased tolerance for ambiguity was associated with a decrease in categoricity

and an increase in the readiness to acknowledge alternative interpretations. Correlation analysis revealed links between participation in intercultural projects and changes in language practices. The intensity of participation (as measured by the number of contact sessions/hours within the learning cycle) was positively correlated with reduced categoricity ($r = 0.63$, $p < 0.001$) and increased reflexivity ($r = 0.51$, $p < 0.001$). A further relationship was observed between language proficiency and attitudinal transformation: students with higher proficiency in the second language demonstrated greater improvement in the quality of their cultural commentary ($r = 0.48$; $p < 0.01$) and in intercultural communicative confidence ($r = 0.42$; $p < 0.01$). These relationships were not interpreted as an “advantage” of a particular group, but rather as an indicator of linguistic asymmetry, which may constrain participation in discussions and thereby reduce the intensity of interaction as a mechanism of transformation.

Qualitative discourse analysis allows describing changes in speech strategies using “before/after” terms without simplifying the findings. Initially, categorical formulations and ethnocentric frames were common, in which the evaluation of another practice was presented as universal according to one’s own norms. There was minimal reflexivity, manifested in the absence of markers limiting knowledge and in insufficient attention to the speaker’s position: statements were produced without sources and without distinguishing between fact and interpretation. Following participation in intercultural practices, conditional constructions became more prevalent, reducing categorical assertions and allowing for alternative perspectives: “It may be considered”, “in a particular context” and “one possible interpretation” are all ways of expressing the same idea. In parallel, strategies for clarification increased, such as asking clarifying questions, reformulating a thesis after receiving feedback and introducing definitions for terms that may have different meanings in another cultural context. Alternative interpretations in writing were recognised in compositional choices, such as comparing two explanatory models, separating “description – evaluation – interpretation”, and introducing counter-argument. Greater ethical sensitivity was reflected in corrected nominations and the avoidance of generalising labels for groups.

Qualitative change is illustrated by excerpts from student texts and discussions. Categorical formulations such as “in this culture people do not value individuality” were used in the initial work, without any contextualisation or reference to a source. In the final work, similar topics were framed differently: For example, “In some social contexts, collective values may be prioritised depending on historical and social factors”, which demonstrates conditional modality and contextualisation. Growth in reflexivity was also evident in discussions: rather than categorically stating that a translation was incorrect, students offered more nuanced responses. “This option may not fully convey the cultural connotation, so it would be appropriate to consider an alternative formulation”. Limits to knowledge and

the presence of different interpretations were marked in the writing (“I assume...”, “it may be interpreted differently...”, “this requires clarification...”), along with counter-arguments or by using “description/evaluation/interpretation” to separate ideas. These changes indicate a shift

from essentialised evaluations to analytical, responsible speech oriented towards interpretation rather than generalisation. Alongside these positive dynamics, the results also identified risks and constraints relevant to the Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev context (Table 4).

Table 4. Risks and constraints in implementing intercultural practices at Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev

No.	Risk/constraint	Description of manifestation in the educational process	Typical effect in speech data (what is recorded)
1	Formalisation of intercultural activities	Interaction is reduced to minimal task completion without reflection and peer assessment	Little or no dynamics in reflexive markers; weak reduction in categorical formulations; persistence of “ready-made” evaluative templates
2	Linguistic asymmetry	Participants with lower proficiency in the interaction language avoid extended turns and choose silent agreement	Fewer episodes of argumentation and reformulation; predominance of short answers; limited initiative in clarifications and questions
3	Unequal participation in discussions	Communicative activity concentrates in a small part of the group	Clear qualitative shifts (reflexivity, conditionality, clarification) mainly among the active “core”; weaker dynamics among peripheral participants
4	Digital format without deep reflection	Online contact occurs without a joint product and without structured reflective procedures	Local politeness markers without sustained restructuring of interpretative strategies; limited contextualisation; weak engagement with alternative readings

Source: compiled by the authors

Having identified these risks, it became clear that the transformative effect of intercultural interaction hinges on the structure of communication and the mechanisms that facilitate participation rather than on contact alone. The most lasting changes were observed when group tasks involved negotiating meaning and included transparent feedback procedures. The risks were factors that “cut short” the

link between interaction and reflection, thereby slowing the establishment of new interpretative norms. This refines the empirical model, since sustainable shifts require regular contact and managed conditions that make speech micro-processes visible and assessable. Generalising the results allowed an empirical model of transformation to be reconstructed as a sequence of interconnected links (Table 5).

Table 5. Empirical model of transformation of value orientations in the process of intercultural interaction (based on the study results)

Stage	Substantive component	Process description	Recorded speech indicators	Outcome effect
1	Intercultural practice	Participation in joint projects, debates, translation tasks, peer assessment	Emergence of clarification episodes; questions addressed to the interlocutor’s position; need to explain terms	Activation of interpretative differences and awareness of multiple perspectives
2	Micro-processes of speech interaction	Clarification of meanings, reformulation of arguments, explanation of cultural connotations	Increase in conditional-modal constructions; paraphrasing markers; reduction in categorical formulations	Reduction of essentialisation; development of the skill of adapting an argument
3	Reflection	Written comments, peer feedback, analysis of discursive strategies	Growth in reflexive markers; references to sources; separation of fact and evaluation	Awareness of the limits of one’s knowledge and responsibility for speech
4	Change in interpretative strategies	Contextualisation of statements; consideration of speaker and addressee positions	Appearance of counter-arguments; pragmatic analysis; correction of nominations	Restructuring of the way texts and discourses are interpreted
5	Stabilisation of new value orientations	Consolidation of changes in regular written and oral practices	Sustained use of inclusive vocabulary; academic accuracy; conditional modality	Formation of responsible, contextualised speech as a manifestation of new value attitudes

Source: compiled by the authors

This model depicts transformation as a sequential process, with each stage connected to the previous and subsequent stages via speech mechanisms. The decisive factor is not merely contact, but structured interaction with reflective elements that convert communicative experience into stable changes in interpretative strategies. Speech indicators precisely allow the transition from situational change to stabilised value orientations to be

recorded. These changes are manifested not only in higher scores on questionnaire scales, but also in a restructuring of textual strategies, including reduced categoricity, an expanded repertoire of inclusive nominations, increased reflexivity and greater precision when working with sources. These shifts were accompanied by the development of specific communicative skills, such as reformulation, contextualisation, and pragmatic analysis, which provide the

link between attitudes and speech practice. Correlations between the intensity of participation in intercultural formats and speech indicators confirm that these changes are not random but driven by structured interaction. At the same time, the identified risks refine the limits of the transformative potential and demonstrate the effect's dependence on the conditions under which communicative practices are implemented. The generalised model enables transformation to be viewed as a staged process, moving from contact interaction to the stabilisation of new interpretative norms. Thus, value shifts appear to result from systematic work with speech rather than from a declarative change in attitudes.

■ DISCUSSION

The increase in inclusivity of nominations, reduction in categoricity and rise in reflexivity in written and oral practices indicates that the internationalisation of learning can affect the structure of speech as well as declared attitudes. The dynamics of the inclusive lexis and categoricity indices suggest a reconfiguration of how social groups and cultural differences are described. In this context, the results align with L. Sercu (2023) conclusions. The author found that “internationalisation at home” initiatives were associated with higher levels of intercultural competence. However, he did not find that they guaranteed automatic change without systematic integration into learning tasks. Similarly, the recorded speech shifts primarily occurred where intercultural practices were embedded in institutional assessment criteria and peer assessment of texts. Unlike L. Sercu, whose research relied mainly on questionnaires, the present study demonstrated the feasibility of capturing change through discursive indicators. This refinement of the mechanism of competence formation is based on speech practices. The strategy of “internationalisation at home” was analysed by M.L. Sierra-Huedo *et al.* (2024) in terms of its substantive content. The authors considered different models for integrating a global dimension into the learning process. Their work emphasised the need for a systemic approach rather than isolated events. The results recorded here confirmed that durable change only emerged under conditions of regularity and clear assessment criteria. However, speech indicators enabled the specification of how such a strategy affects students' interpretative practices.

Another aspect to consider is the shift from general attitudes to a sense of responsibility for speech as a civic stance. The increased use of reflexive markers and greater accuracy in citation suggest that intercultural interaction has activated the ethical dimension of academic communication. This finding is consistent with A's approach. A. Barili & M. Byram (2021), who viewed service-learning as a pathway to intercultural citizenship, in which speech serves as a means of social participation. While their work emphasised engagement with communities and civic initiatives, the shifts recorded here arose within instructional formats, including translation and discursive tasks. Both

approaches treat language as a space of ethical choice, but differ in their mechanisms: in service-learning, transformation occurs through interaction with the community, whereas here it occurs through intensive work with text and peer assessment.

The ability to reformulate an argument and consider the addressee's position indicates a greater sensitivity to different cultures at the level of communicative action. An increase in explanatory paraphrasing and conditional modality indicates a shift from self-sufficient statements to dialogic ones. Similar attention to cultural mediation in arts education was demonstrated by R. Li (2024), who analysed music education as a means of international communication. The author found that intercultural exchange through music enhanced the ability to interpret cultural symbols in other contexts. Both cases demonstrate that interaction alters how meaning is represented, despite the differences between the fields. The difference lies in the material: in music education, transformation occurs through the symbolic interpretation of artistic forms; in philological settings, it occurs through discourse analysis, translation, and argumentation.

The increase in indicators of plurilingual flexibility and the quality of cultural commentary is linked to the development of interpretative precision. Higher mean scores on translation tasks, along with correlations with language proficiency, suggest an interdependence between linguistic resources and value orientations. In this context, J.W.N. dela Cruz (2023) advocated a plurilingual approach based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) as a means of linguistic inclusion. The author emphasised the importance of considering students' linguistic repertoires in assessments. The results recorded here confirmed that linguistic asymmetry affects participation intensity and the depth of reflection. At the same time, the empirical data show that systematic peer assessment fosters paraphrasing and clarification even across different proficiency levels, expanding understanding of plurilingualism as a dynamic resource rather than merely an individual characteristic.

Reconceptualising intercultural interaction as a process that fosters cultural humility aligns with A. de la Garza (2021) findings, which viewed the internationalisation of Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Mathematics (STEAM) curricula as a shift from intercultural competence to cultural humility. The recorded increase in conditional constructions and willingness to acknowledge alternative interpretations can be interpreted as a manifestation of such humility – an awareness of the limits of one's knowledge. The difference lies in the disciplinary focus. STEAM emphasises the integration of arts and technologies, whereas the philological approach relies on textual analysis. In both cases, however, the emphasis shifts from accumulating knowledge to changing one's interpretative stance. The correlations between responsibility for speech and pragmatic text analysis support the arguments of S. Aririguzoh (2022), who emphasised the link between communication skills

and achieving sustainable development goals through intercultural dialogue. The author considers communication as an instrument for aligning values across cultures. The present results specify this connection at the level of speech markers: responsibility for speech is demonstrated through precise nominations and the distinction between facts and evaluations. Thus, the concept of communication as a social resource is confirmed in an academic context. Changes in the interpretation of stereotypes and discursive strategies are consistent with the findings of A.A. Adediran (2025), who examined social studies as a means of reorienting values. In his study, transformation occurred through discussion of cultural diversity and historical narratives. In the philological dimension, change was reflected in the ability to recognise generalising devices and distinguish between stereotypes and facts. The difference lies in the focus: social studies focused on the subject matter, whereas philological analysis focused on the linguistic mechanisms of constructing meaning. The shared conclusion concerns the role of education as a space for reconfiguring values.

S. Hackett *et al.* (2024) clarified the boundaries of COIL and its differences from virtual exchange, emphasising the need for a clearly designed integration of international collaboration into the course structure rather than treating it as an additional activity. In their approach, key COIL features include the joint formulation of learning outcomes, coordination among instructors from different institutions, and an assessment system that considers interaction and collective production. The discursive data obtained confirm this logic: where interaction was limited to exchanging presentations or brief comments without peer assessment, no substantial growth in reflexive markers or reduction in categoricity was observed. Conversely, in groups where collaborative work culminated in an agreed text involving reasoned editing of positions, stable shifts were observed in argument structure and pragmatic precision. This suggests that, when embedded within institutions and integrated into assessment, collaboration functions as a transformative mechanism, whereas superficial exchange remains at the level of situational contact, leading to no lasting change in speech strategies. The positive correlation between the intensity of participation in intercultural formats and reduced categoricity confirms the importance of interaction structure. The increase in the reflexivity index and intercultural confidence indicators is consistent with the findings of K.S. Spieler *et al.* (2025), who analysed COIL in teacher education and documented changes in communicative attitudes. However, their study focused primarily on self-assessments, whereas the present discursive data reveal textual shifts, enabling the alignment of quantitative and qualitative dimensions. This comparison highlights that the effectiveness of COIL as a format depends on the depth of collaboration and the presence of reflective procedures, as demonstrated by the risk analysis.

The improved media literacy indicators and enhanced ability to analyse text pragmatics align with J.S. Tibaldo (2022) findings. J.S. Tibaldo examined MIL competencies

among language and communication students, emphasising the necessity of their systematic integration into curricula. The author showed that sporadic media literacy instruction does not ensure the sustained development of analytical skills; however, combining theoretical analysis with practical tasks fosters critical awareness of manipulative strategies. The increase in mean scores for analysing the pragmatic function of utterances and the clearer distinction between fact and evaluation in texts demonstrate a similar trend. At the same time, media literacy was considered within a broader intercultural context, combining pragmatic analysis with an evaluation of the ethical consequences of speech and responsibility for interpretation. Finally, the development of creativity as a component of intercultural competence, emphasised by J. Braslauskas (2021), was indirectly supported by the increased ability to generate alternative interpretations. In his study, creativity was considered fundamental to effective intercultural communication. The conditional constructions and compositional decisions recorded in writing suggest that interpretative flexibility is a key component of this type of creativity. In the philological context, however, it takes the form of structured analysis rather than purely creative self-expression.

In summary, the results suggest that intercultural interaction in humanities education is most effective when incorporated into the design of learning and assessment. Changes in speech, from nominations to pragmatic analysis, reflect a deeper restructuring of interpretative strategies. Comparisons with international studies confirm that this transformation does not occur automatically as a result of contact, but rather requires structured conditions and reflection. Furthermore, the empirical data specify the mechanisms of this process at the textual level, thereby expanding the scope of philological analysis of intercultural practices.

■ CONCLUSIONS

The study found that the transformation of humanities students' value orientations during intercultural interactions has a speech-based, empirically observable nature and can be measured using clearly defined textual indicators. Analysis showed that integrating an intercultural dimension into curricula involves more than just expanding the thematic scope of course content; it also involves restructuring interpretative strategies, argumentation models, and academic writing practices. The results confirmed that the most reliable markers of transformation were changes in nomination choice, judgement modality, the frequency of reflexive constructions, and the way sources were handled. Statistically significant shifts in values and attitudes were also recorded: the frequency of inclusive nominations increased from 6.8 to 11.4 per 1,000 words, the categoricity index decreased from 14.2 to 7.9 and the number of reflexive markers increased from 4.5 to 12.7 per 1,000 words. This confirms that attitudinal changes do not remain declarative, but manifest in concrete speech practices.

Therefore, it becomes possible to interpret value shifts as the result of systematic communicative work rather than a situational response to intercultural contact.

In terms of skills, an increased ability to reformulate arguments was observed (from an average of 1.8 to 4.6 reformulations per discussion), alongside an improvement in the quality of cultural commentary in translation tasks (from an average of 2.6 to 4.1 out of 5). There was also a higher proportion of correctly integrated academic references (rising from 68% to 89%). These results suggest a correlation between value attitudes and communicative competence, indicating that ethical sensitivity fosters the development of specific textual skills, such as argumentative precision, contextualisation, and pragmatic analysis. In terms of knowledge and critical understanding, the results confirmed an improved ability to identify discursive strategies (increasing from 58% to 81%), detect stereotypical frames (increasing from 43% to 74%), and analyse the pragmatic functions of utterances (increasing from 2.1 to 4.3 points). This suggests the development of a more sophisticated model of textual interpretation that considers the speaker's position, the addressee and the social consequences of speech. Questionnaire indicators confirmed these textual shifts, with tolerance for ambiguity increasing by $\Delta = +0.77$, responsibility for speech by $\Delta = +0.87$ and intercultural communicative confidence by $\Delta = +0.66$. Correlation analysis revealed a relationship between participation intensity and changes in speech indicators ($r = 0.63$ for a reduction in categoricity and $r = 0.51$ for

an increase in reflexivity). Therefore, transformation depended not on formal participation, but on the structure and depth of interaction.

One practical outcome of the study was the development of an empirical model of transformation, which describes the following sequence: intercultural practice → speech micro-processes → reflection → change in interpretative strategies → stabilisation of value orientations. The conclusions support the recommendation to integrate intercultural tasks into assessments, to introduce peer feedback procedures, and to include elements of discourse analysis and pragmatic interpretation within humanities programmes. However, the study also had limitations. The empirical data were collected within a single university environment, limiting direct extrapolation to other contexts. Additionally, the influence of external social factors and individual student characteristics could not be fully controlled. Further research could involve a comparative analysis across several universities, the long-term tracking of changes and the expansion of the toolkit for coding discursive data.

■ ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None.

■ FUNDING

None.

■ CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

■ REFERENCES

- [1] Adediran, A.A. (2025). [Appraisal of social studies education for cultural sharing and transformation towards value re-orientation in Nigeria](#). *Osiel Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 10(1), 184-191.
- [2] American Sociological Association. (1999). *Code of Ethics and Policies and Procedures of the ASA Committee on Professional Ethics*. Retrieved from <https://www.asanet.org/wp-content/uploads/code-of-ethics.pdf>.
- [3] Aririguzoh, S. (2022). Communication competencies, culture and SDGs: Effective processes to cross-cultural communication. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9, article number 96. [doi: 10.1057/s41599-022-01109-4](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01109-4).
- [4] Bajec, M.L. (2024). Fostering intercultural education at tertiary level: A case study with students of humanities. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 17, 135-152. [doi: 10.18690/rei.4578](https://doi.org/10.18690/rei.4578).
- [5] Barili, A., & Byram, M. (2021). Teaching intercultural citizenship through intercultural service learning in world language education. *Foreign Language Annals*, 54(3), 776-799. [doi: 10.1111/flan.12526](https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12526).
- [6] Braslauskas, J. (2021). Developing intercultural competences and creativity: The foundation for successful intercultural communication. *Creativity Studies*, 14(1), 197-217. [doi: 10.3846/cs.2021.14583](https://doi.org/10.3846/cs.2021.14583).
- [7] Chaisiri, S. (2025). Virtual exchanges in higher education: Advancing intercultural competence and language confidence. *Research Studies in English Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(3), 448-468. [doi: 10.62583/rseltl.v3i3.88](https://doi.org/10.62583/rseltl.v3i3.88).
- [8] Council of Europe. (2020). *Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture (RFCDC)*. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/rfcdc-guidance-document-for-higher-education/1680a08ee0>.
- [9] de la Garza, A. (2021). Internationalizing the curriculum for STEAM (STEM+ arts and humanities): From intercultural competence to cultural humility. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 25(2), 123-135. [doi: 10.1177/1028315319888468](https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315319888468).
- [10] Deardorff, D.K., & Jones, E. (2022). Intercultural competence as a core focus in international higher education. In D.K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, B. Leask & H. Charles (Eds.), *The handbook of international higher education* (pp. 223-241). New York: Routledge. [doi: 10.4324/9781003447863-15](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003447863-15).
- [11] dela Cruz, J.W.N. (2023). [Teaching and assessing plurilingually using the CEFR: Towards linguistically inclusive additional language instruction](#). *Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 7, 55-74.

- [12] Dosmanova, G., Supataeva, E., Ibragimov, R., Ilyas, A., & Pazilova, A. (2025). The role of language in shaping communication culture among students: A comparative study of Kazakh and Kyrgyz university students. *Open Education Studies*, 7(1), article number 20250081. doi: [10.1515/edu-2025-0081](https://doi.org/10.1515/edu-2025-0081).
- [13] Edwards, L., & Ritchie, B. (2022). [Challenging and confronting: The role of humanities in fostering critical thinking, cultural competency and an evolution of worldview in enabling education](#). *Student Success*, 13(1), 10-20.
- [14] European Commission. (2021). *Ethics and data protection*. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/guidance/ethics-and-data-protection_en.pdf.
- [15] European Commission. (2025). *Erasmus + programme guide*. Retrieved from https://erasmus-plus.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2025-01/erasmus-programme-guide-v2.2025_en.pdf.
- [16] European Youth Portal. (n.d.). *Erasmus + virtual exchanges*. Retrieved from https://youth.europa.eu/erasmusvirtual_en.
- [17] Gosling, M., & Yang, W. (2022). Introducing internationalisation at home: Learning satisfaction under the content and language integrated learning approach. *Learning and Teaching*, 15(1), 46-66. doi: [10.3167/latiss.2022.150104](https://doi.org/10.3167/latiss.2022.150104).
- [18] Guillén-Yparrea, N., & Ramírez-Montoya, M.S. (2023). Intercultural competencies in higher education: A systematic review from 2016 to 2021. *Cogent Education*, 10(1), article number 2167360. doi: [10.1080/2331186X.2023.2167360](https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2167360).
- [19] Hackett, S., Dawson, M., Janssen, J., & van Tartwijk, J. (2024). Defining collaborative online international learning (COIL) and distinguishing it from virtual exchange. *TechTrends*, 68(6), 1078-1094. doi: [10.1007/s11528-024-01000-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-024-01000-w).
- [20] Hackett, S., Janssen, J., Beach, P., Perreault, M., Beelen, J., & Van Tartwijk, J. (2023). The effectiveness of Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) on intercultural competence development in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), article number 5. doi: [10.1186/s41239-022-00373-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00373-3).
- [21] ICC/ESOMAR International Code on Market, Opinion and Social Research and Data Analytics. (2025, September). Retrieved from <https://iccwbo.org/news-publications/business-solutions/iccesomar-international-code-market-opinion-social-research-data-analytics/>.
- [22] Lähdesmäki, T., & Koistinen, A.-K. (2021). Explorations of linkages between intercultural dialogue, art, and empathy. In F. Maine & M. Vrikkki (Eds.), *Dialogue for intercultural understanding: Placing cultural literacy at the heart of learning* (pp. 45-58). Cham: Springer. doi: [10.1007/978-3-030-71778-0_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71778-0_4).
- [23] Li, R. (2024). International communication and cultural exchange based on music: A study of the experience of Chinese music education in other countries. *Music Education Research*, 26(2), 155-169. doi: [10.1080/14613808.2023.2294313](https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2023.2294313).
- [24] Liddicoat, A.J., & Derivry-Plard, M. (2021). Intercultural mediation in language and culture teaching and learning and the CEFR Companion Volume. *Research in Language and Culture Didactics*, 18-1. doi: [10.4000/rdlc.8648](https://doi.org/10.4000/rdlc.8648).
- [25] Liu, D., Wimpenny, K., DeWinter, A., & Harrison, P. (2023). Students' perceptions and experiences of teaching and learning in transnational higher education in China: Implications of the intercultural dialogue framework. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(7), 1465-1483. doi: [10.1080/13562517.2021.1900817](https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.1900817).
- [26] Ma, J. (2025). [Tolerance as a social phenomenon in the education of humanities students](#). *Journal of Institutional Research South East Asia*, 23(3), 90-114.
- [27] Marsee, M., & Hoyos, J.E.P. (2025). Enhancing intercultural skills through a COIL experience. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 27(1), 31-48. doi: [10.15446/profile.v27n1.113511](https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v27n1.113511).
- [28] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2019). *OECD future of education and skills 2030: Conceptual learning framework. Attitudes and values for 2030*. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/about/projects/edu/education-2040/concept-notes/Attitudes and Values for 2030 concept note.pdf>.
- [29] Rojas-Estrada, E.G., Aguaded, I., & Garcia-Ruiz, R. (2024). Media and information literacy in the prescribed curriculum: A systematic review on its integration. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(8), 9445-9472. doi: [10.1007/s10639-023-12154-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12154-0).
- [30] Rückl, M. (2024). Teaching and learning materials to foster plurilingualism. In C. Fäcke, X.A. Gao & P. Garrett-Rucks (Eds.), *The handbook of plurilingual and intercultural language learning* (pp. 415-429). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons Ltd. doi: [10.1002/9781394165957.ch29](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394165957.ch29).
- [31] Sercu, L. (2023). Internationalization at home as a factor affecting intercultural competence. A study among Belgian university students. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 13(4), 536-557. doi: [10.1080/21568235.2022.2094815](https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2022.2094815).
- [32] Shozimov, P. (2023). [The creation of an innovative cross-disciplinary methodology in Central Asia as a result of a dialogue between Western European and Central Asian systems of philosophical thought](#). *Europe and the Orient*, 1, 67-91.
- [33] Sierra-Huedo, M.L., Bruton, L., & Fernández, C. (2024). Becoming global at home: An analysis of existing cases and a proposal for the future of internationalization at home. *Journal of Education*, 204(1), 241-254. doi: [10.1177/00220574221108053](https://doi.org/10.1177/00220574221108053).
- [34] Soulé, M.V., Parmaxi, A., & Nicolaou, A. (2025). Internationalization at home in higher education: a systematic review of teaching and learning practices. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 17(7), 29-60. doi: [10.1108/JARHE-10-2023-0484](https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-10-2023-0484).

- [35] Spieler, K.S., Engtrø, R., Pedersen, L.L., & Olsen, A.K.V. (2025). A Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) experience in early childhood teacher education. *Education Sciences*, 15(4), article number 494. [doi: 10.3390/educsci15040494](https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15040494).
- [36] Tibaldo, J.S. (2022). Media and Information Literacy (MIL) competencies of language and communication students. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 14(2), 44-57. [doi: 10.23860/JMLE-2022-14-2-4](https://doi.org/10.23860/JMLE-2022-14-2-4).
- [37] Zadavec, K.A. (2025). Internationalisation at home and internationalisation of the curriculum in higher education- conceptual demarcations and implementation practice. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, 76(142), 24-40. [doi: 10.63384/spB51z718as](https://doi.org/10.63384/spB51z718as).

Маданияттар аралык өз ара аракеттенүү практикасына катышуу процессинде гуманитардык студенттердин баалуулук багыттарын өзгөртүү

Нуржан Сартбекова

Педагогика илимдеринин доктору, профессор

И. Арабаев атындагы Кыргыз мамлекеттик университети

720026, Раззаков көч., 49, Бишкек ш., Кыргыз Республикасы

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1632-2359>

Алина Мотукеева

Аспирант

И. Арабаев атындагы Кыргыз Мамлекеттик Университети

720026, Раззаков көч., 49, Бишкек ш., Кыргыз Республикасы

<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5252-908X>

Каныкей Карыпова

Аспирант

И. Арабаев атындагы Кыргыз Мамлекеттик Университети

720026, Раззаков көч., 49, Бишкек ш., Кыргыз Республикасы

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1914-5909>

Назарбек Акылбек уулу

Аспирант

Ала-Тоо Эл аралык Университети

720048, Анкара көч., 1/8, Бишкек ш., Кыргыз Республикасы

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4657-0101>

Нурзат Усупова

Аспирант

Ала-Тоо Эл аралык Университети

720048, Анкара көч., 1/8, Бишкек ш., Кыргыз Республикасы

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-3477-0106>

Аннотация. Изилдөөнүн максаты гуманитардык илимдер факультетинин студенттеринин баалуулук багыттарынын маданияттар аралык өз ара аракеттенүү аркылуу кантип өзгөрөрүн сөз жана тексттик көрсөткүчтөргө таянып моделдөө болду. Изилдөө этаптуу аралаш ыкмалар менен жүргүзүлүп, билим берүү алкагындагы документтерди талдоону студенттердин тексттеринин корпусуна, топтук талкуу материалдарына жана анкеталык сурамжылоолордун жыйынтыктарына негизделген жупташтырылган “мурда/кийин” өлчөө ыкмалары менен айкалыштырды. Эмпирикалык этап 2025-жылдын январь айынан сентябрь айына чейин Кыргыз Республикасындагы И. Арабаев атындагы Кыргыз Мамлекеттик Университетинде өттү. Андан соң баалуулуктар жана көз караштар, коммуникативдик көндүмдөр, билим жана сынчыл түшүнүктөн турган операциялык үч деңгээлдүү трансформация модели сунушталды. Өзгөрүүлөр төмөнкү өлчөнүүчү сүйлөө параметрлери аркылуу катталды: номинациялардын инклюзивдүүлүгү, категориялык баа берүүлөр, билдирүүлөрдүн рефлексивдүүлүгү, булактар менен иштөөдө илимий тактык, маданий комментарийдин сапаты жана тексттин прагматикасын жөн гана жарыялоо эмес, аны талдоого жөндөмдүүлүк. 1000 сөзгө нормалдаштырылган жуп тексттердин сандык анализи инклюзивдүү лингвистикалык бирдиктердин жыштыгы 6,8ден 11,4кө, рефлексивдүү маркерлердин жыштыгы 4,5тен 12,7ге чейин өскөнүн көрсөттү. Ал эми категориялык индекс 14,2дөн 7,9го чейин төмөндөдү. Көндүмдөр жагынан алганда, талкууларда аргументти кайра формулирлөө учурларынын саны ар бир талкууда 1,8дөн 4,6га чейин өстү, котормо тапшырмаларындагы маданий комментарийдин сапаты орточо 2,6дан 5тен 4,1ге чейин жакшырды, ал эми туура форматталган жана функционалдык жактан интеграцияланган шилтемелердин үлүшү 68 %дан 89 %га чейин жогорулады. Критикалык түшүнүүнүн деңгээли да жакшырды: дискурсивдик стратегияларды туура аныктоо пайызы 58 %дан 81 %га чейин өстү; стереотиптүү рамкаларды так аныктоо пайызы 43 %дан 74 %га чейин жогорулады; тексттин прагматикалык функциясын талдоодогу жалпы упай 2,1дөн 4,3кө чейин өстү. Анкеталык өлчөө ыкмалары белгисиздикке чыдамдуулуктун (3,12ден 3,89га), сүйлөшүүдө жоопкерчиликтиң (3,34төн 4,21ге) жана маданияттар аралык коммуникативдик ишенимдин

(3,28ден 3,94гө) өсүшүн көрсөттү. Интермәдени иш-чараларга катышуунун интенсивдүүлүгү категориялык баа берүүлөрдүн азайышы менен оң байланышта экени аныкталды. Изилдөөнүн практикалык маанилүүлүгү сунушталган сүйлөм көрсөткүчтөр системасын жана сүрөттөлгөн моделди гуманитардык программалардын алкагында интермәдени билим берүү практикаларын иштеп чыгуу, баалоо жана тууралоо куралы катары колдонуу мүмкүнчүлүгүндө жатат. Бул жазуу иштерин баалоо критерийлерин, кесиптештерди баалоо процедураларын жана туруктуу, баалуулуктарга негизделген өзгөрүүлөрдү илгерилеткен тапшырмаларды иштеп чыгууда колдонулушу мүмкүн

Негизги сөздөр: сүйлөө; байланыш; эл аралыктандыруу; камтуучулук; дискурсивдик стратегиялар; категориялык баа берүүлөр; белгисиздикке чыдамдуулук

Трансформация ценностных ориентаций студентов гуманитарных наук в процессе участия в практиках межкультурного взаимодействия

Нурджан Сартбекова

Доктор педагогических наук, профессор
Кыргызский государственный университет имени И. Арабаева
720026, ул. Раззакова, 49, г. Бишкек, Кыргызская Республика
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1632-2359>

Алина Мотукеева

Аспирант
Кыргызский государственный университет имени И. Арабаева
720026, ул. Раззакова, 49, г. Бишкек, Кыргызская Республика
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5252-908X>

Каныкей Карыпова

Аспирант
Кыргызский государственный университет имени И. Арабаева
720026, ул. Раззакова, 49, г. Бишкек, Кыргызская Республика
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1914-5909>

Назарбек Акылбек уулу

Аспирант
Международный университет Ала-Тоо
720048, ул. Анкара, 1/8, г. Бишкек, Кыргызская Республика
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4657-0101>

Нурзат Усупова

Аспирант
Международный университет Ала-Тоо
720048, ул. Анкара, 1/8, г. Бишкек, Кыргызская Республика
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-3477-0106>

Аннотация. Целью исследования было моделирование трансформации ценностных ориентаций студентов гуманитарных специальностей в процессе межкультурного взаимодействия с использованием речевых и текстовых индикаторов. Исследование было разработано как поэтапное изучение смешанных методов, сочетающее анализ документов образовательной структуры с парными измерениями «до/после», основанными на корпусе студенческих текстов, материалах групповых дискуссий и результатах анкетирования. Эмпирический этап проходил в Кыргызском государственном университете имени И. Арабаева в период с января по сентябрь 2025 года. Впоследствии была предложена операциональная трехуровневая модель трансформации, включающая ценности и установки, коммуникативные навыки, а также знания и критическое понимание. Изменения фиксировались с помощью измеримых речевых параметров, таких как инклюзивность номинаций, категориальные суждения, рефлексивность высказываний, академическая точность при работе с источниками, качество культурного комментария и способность анализировать прагматику текста, а не просто констатировать ее. Количественный анализ парных текстов, нормализованных на 1000 слов, показал, что частота инклюзивных языковых единиц увеличилась с 6,8 до 11,4, а частота рефлексивных маркеров – с 4,5 до 12,7. При этом категориальный индекс снизился с 14,2 до 7,9. Что касается навыков, частота эпизодов переформулирования аргументов в дискуссиях увеличилась с 1,8 до 4,6 на дискуссию, качество культурного комментария в переводческих задачах улучшилось в среднем с 2,6 до 4,1 из 5, а доля правильно оформленных и функционально интегрированных ссылок выросла с 68 % до 89 %. Также наблюдалось улучшение уровня критического понимания: доля правильных идентификаций дискурсивных стратегий увеличилась с 58 % до 81 %; доля точных идентификаций стереотипных фреймов увеличилась с 43 % до 74 %. Общий балл за анализ прагматической функции текста увеличился с 2,1 до 4,3. Измерения с помощью анкеты показали рост толерантности к неопределенности (с 3,12 до 3,89), ответственности в речи (с 3,34 до 4,21) и уверенности в межкультурной коммуникации (с 3,28 до 3,94). Интенсивность участия в межкультурных мероприятиях положительно коррелировала с уменьшением количества категориальных

суждений. Практическая значимость исследования заключается в потенциальном применении предложенной системы речевых индикаторов и описанной модели в качестве инструментов для разработки, оценки и корректировки межкультурных образовательных практик в рамках гуманитарных программ. Это может быть использовано для разработки критериев оценки письменных работ, процедур взаимной оценки и заданий, способствующих устойчивым, основанным на ценностях изменениям

Ключевые слова: речь; коммуникация; интернационализация; инклюзивность; дискурсивные стратегии; категорические суждения; терпимость к неопределенности