І. О. Алєксєєва

ВСТУП ДО ТЕОРІЇ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

Підручник

Алєксєєва, І. О.

Вступ до теорії міжкультурної комунікації : Підручник / І. О. Алєксєєва. – К. : Видавничо-поліграфічний центр "Київський університет", 2011. – 300 с.

Мета посібника полягає в ознайомленні студентів з основними проблемами міжкультурної комунікації на сучасному етапі. Оскільки теорія міжкультурної комунікації має міждисциплінарний характер, у підручнику аналізуються як фундаментальні теорії міжкультурної комунікації, явище акультурації, сприйняття та атрибуції, що належать до кола антропологічних, етнографічних, психологічних та соціологічних проблем, так і лінгвістичний аспект міжкультурної взаємодії – вербальні та невербальні засоби комунікації.

Після кожного розділу посібника пропонується низка практичних завдань, які сприяють формуванню в студентів стійких навичок застосування на практиці знань, набутих у процесі вивчення теорії предмету, а також розвитку міжкультурної компетенції.

Посібник призначений для студентів факультетів іноземних мов, міжнародних відношень та паблік релейшнз.

CHAPTER I
Development of Cross-Cultural Studies

1. Introduction to cross-cultural studies

The process of globalization has embraced nowadays all spheres of human life. Though history of humanity used to be the history of separate states, peoples and cultures, today it is obviously turning into global history. With borders vanishing, modern cultures lose their specific features and closed nature.

> There is repeated evidence that all people in the world are connected to each other through six other people, called "six degrees of separation". Such a statement sounds absolutely preposterous, but trials including the sending letters to internet searches for other people reach the same outcome time and time again — we are all basically linked through only six other people!

A positive consequence of globalization is the possibility to communicate with representatives of different cultures: a great number of people take part in international forums and conferences, work in international political, economic and professional organizations, multinational companies, students study overseas, tourists travel all over the world. Fast transport, modern communication means, and the Internet have made the world so much smaller that interaction of states, peoples and cultures has become inevitable and permanent. Clearly, in order to maintain these varied and many-layered contacts, it is not sufficient to speak a certain language, it is necessary to know norms and rules of other cultures. Every participant of international contacts quickly realizes that it is far from enough to master a foreign

language to achieve cross-cultural understanding. It is vital to know the whole complex of partners' behavioral norms, psychology, culture, history, etc. Finally, it is necessary to know communication process as such in order to predict and prevent partners' possible wrong interpretations.

Ethnic, racial, social and cultural variety of the world opens up endless possibilities for mutual personal growth. Communicating with those who are not like us, we acquire new skills and abilities as well as develop those that we already have.

It is well known that we get to know the world through our own experience and tend to ascribe our own experience to other people, projecting our worldview onto them. In other words, a person assesses other people's behaviour from the viewpoint of his/her own value system. Ascribing our own world perception to others, we, so to say, "double" ourselves and quite often begin seeing in our communication partner not so much a different unique personality, but our own spitting image, identical with ourselves. In order to break the egocentric circle, it is important to see in every person a one-off personality, to replace our usual orientation to ourselves with the orientation to the other person's inner world.

In order to avoid mistakes and conflicts in communication, it should be remembered that "other" means first of all "different from myself". Everyone preserves their unique nature due to their specific life. The more one understands what makes people different from each other, the shorter the route to understanding will be.

Dissimilarity of people has, however, its disadvantages: the more different are tempers, upbringing styles, education, cultures, the more possibilities communicators have for conflicts and misunderstanding. Therefore contacts between two peoples, social groups or cultures require quite much from each participant: people have to master various forms and means of cultural communication as well as basic psychological knowledge. Everybody has to develop their own communication skills, use them and gloss over possible tension, misunderstanding and conflicts. These factors draw scientists' attention to **cross-cultural communication** (CCC) (also referred to as **intercultural communication**) as phenomenon that requires thorough analysis.

Since it was linguists who initiated CC research, CCC has been considered for quite a long time as communication between two languages. It is obvious, however, that the problems go well beyond Linguistics and should actually be studied by several scientific branches, i.e. psychology, ethnology, culture studies, semiotics, etc.

Nowadays, CCC is studied by a number of humanitarian sciences: culture studies, communication studies, culture sociology, linguacultural studies, ethnopsychology etc. The research has also shifted both towards interethnic relations, and towards communication strategies used to deal with majority or mainstream populations. The introduction of power as a cultural communication variable extends the field of research.

CCC appeared as a subject of scientific research in the USA in the middle of the 20th century due to a number of social and political factors. In Europe the issue of CCC arose later in response to the influx of workforce from other regions of the planet as well as due to orientation of the sociocultural development to tolerance and cross-cultural understanding.

All in all, we shall speak not only about the immediate communication but also try to distinguish sociocultural experience, knowledge, interpretations, opinions, values and norms that have become peculiar to a culture and nowadays make up specific features of peoples as communicators. The main aspects of the approach suggested by culture studies are:

- *history* (any cultural phenomenon results from development of human culture);
- *morphology* (any cultural phenomenon consists of certain parts);
- *personality* (any culture is made up from knowledge, beliefs, customs, skills, habits and behavioural stereotypes adopted by a human as social being);
- *values and orientation* (culture is a value system);
- *activity* (culture is a process by which one performs certain actions to achieve one's goals and desired results).

Each of the aspects reveals a certain facet of a culture and can be observed in interactions. The aspects may not be opposed to each other but any of them may become a cornerstone of research.

This book aims at helping you be ready for difficult situations in CCC, it will give you knowledge and skills to successfully interact with people from other cultures, form your cross-cultural competence. It will suggest you the holistic theoretical approach to CCC, since you will view it from various angles. You will acquire practical skills in CCC and analyze a number of examples that will illustrate theoretical reasoning.

2. Development of cross-cultural communication theory

To analyze development of the CCC theory, one should turn to the famous philosopher and linguist **Wilhelm von Humboldt** (1767–1835), namely to the introduction to his greatest work, *The Heterogeneity of Language and its Influence on the Intellectual Development of Mankind,* published in 1836. There, the scholar first suggested that the character and structure of a language expresses the inner life and knowledge of its speakers, and that languages must differ from one another in the same way and to the same degree as their speakers. Humboldt argued that sounds do not become words until a meaning is put into them, and this meaning embodies the thought of the community.

Humboldt's views enable us to see him as an originator of the **linguistic relativity hypothesis** (more commonly known as the **Sapir-Whorf hypothesis**). It is remarkable that he pointed out the relation between a language and its speakers' worldview approximately a century before either Edward Sapir or Benjamin Whorf did. The latter scholars put forward the idea of linguistic determinism, i.e. they claim that speakers' thought and worldview are determined by their language. Thus, Whorf writes: "formulation of ideas is not an independent process…, but is part of a particular grammar and differs, from slightly to greatly, as between grammars. We dissect nature

along lines laid down by our native languages. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face… We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significance as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way…" [Brown 1998, p. 46].

Dependence of vocabulary on life experience may be backed up withcopious facts. Thus, the Eskimos have special names for types of snow, Arabs – for types of camels, inhabitants of equatorial regions – for types of rain. Words denoting colours are also culture specific. In the Shona of Rhodesia and the Bassa of Liberia the languages have fewer colour categories than European languages and they break up the spectrum at different points. Of course, the Shona and Bassa are able to perceive and describe other colours, in the same way that an English speaker might describe a "dark bluish green", but the labels provided by the language tend to shape the person's overall cognitive organization of colour and to cause varying degrees of colour discrimination.

Words are not the only linguistic category affecting thought. The way a sentence is structured will affect nuances of meaning. Elizabeth Loftus in 1976 research discovered that subtle differences in the structure of questions can affect the answer a person gives. For example, upon viewing a film of a car accident subjects were asked questions like "Did you see *the* broken headlight?" in some cases, and in other cases "Did you see *a* broken headlight?" Questions using *the* tended to produce more false recognition of events. That is, the presence of the definite article led subjects to believe that there *was* a broken headlight, whether they saw it or not.

We may take verbal categories in two languages and discover a more vivid example of different world categorization. Thus, in English finite verbs are marked for time reference, sometimes – person, number, mood, and state. The American Indian language, Hopi, does not use verbs in the same way. In Hopi, the English sentence *he is running* will have to be translated in one of the following ways:

1. *I know that he's running at this very moment*
2. *I know that he's running though I cannot see him*

3. *I remember I saw him running and I presume he is still running*
4. *I am told that he is running*

So the verbal categories in Hopi show that for Hopi speakers the knowledge of the speaker and the validity of the statement are important (for more details see p. 84–85).

The Whorfian hypothesis has been criticized frequently by linguists and psychologists since it was formulated by Whorf in 1940. Psychologists have maintained that the strong version of the hypothesis, which states that language controls both thought and perception, has been proven false. As a result of heated debates, a weak version, supported by the findings that there are cultural differences in the semantic associations evoked by seemingly common concepts, is generally accepted nowadays. Besides, the positivistic climate of the time rejected any intimation that language determined thought rather than the other way round; the position that we are prisoners of our language seemed unacceptable (actually, taken too far, it might lead to racism).

Fifty years later, interest in the linguistic relativity principle revived. If speakers of different languages do not understand one another, it is not because their languages cannot be mutually translated – which they obviously can, to a certain extent. It is because they do not share the same way of viewing and interpreting events, they do not agree on the meaning and the value of the concepts underlying the words. Understanding across languages does not depend on structural equivalences but on common conceptual systems, born from the larger context of our experience.

In other words, the 20th century linguistics rests on the consensus that language, thought and culture are three parts of a whole and cannot operate independently, regardless of which one most influences the other two. To see them as three points in a constantly flowing continuum is surely more accurate than, say, to see them as a triangle with one dominant over the other two. Some linguists consider that the lack of acceptance of artificial languages such as Esperanto, may be explained by their isolation from culture.

The rapid development and application of cross-cultural studies began after World War II. Originally, it was applied within businesses

and the government both seeking to expand globally. Technological progress and quick development of various forms of international contacts were much ahead of the development of communication skills and historically formed cultural models. Therefore, it is not surprising that the problem of dialogue and understanding between cultures became the key issue in the 70s. At that time, the focus was on specific features and main differences between different cultures. It was then that businesses began to offer language training to their employees. Yet, even employees who mastered a foreign language turned out to be ill-equipped for overseas work in the globalizing market. As a result, companies started to introduce programmes to train employees how to act when abroad.

2.1. Cross-cultural communication studies in the USA

The new scientific trend resulted from practical interests of American politicians, businesspeople, diplomats who had the urgent need to understand reasons for ethnic conflicts and solve the problems that accompany intercultural interactions. The matter is that after the World War II, the sphere of American political, economic and cultural influence expanded all over the world. While dealing with their partners abroad, American state officials and businesspeople often turned out to be rather helpless. Their interaction frequently led to conflicts, mutual dislike, offences on the part of representatives of other cultures. Even perfect knowledge of languages did not eliminate the problems.

Besides, in the post-war period, the USA worked out an economic aid programme for developing countries. Within the framework of certain projects, experts and activists of the Peace Corps visited various countries where they also faced misunderstanding and conflicts that quite often turned their mission into a failure. From the very beginning of practical implementation of the programme, the programme management and ordinary executives realized that they were poorly trained to solve concrete problems with representatives of other cultures. Numerous failures of the Peace Corps activists exposed the need of a special training where the focus of attention should be on working out practical skills of CCC rather than on superficial informing of cultural peculiarities.

To deal with the situation, the US Administration established the Foreign Service Institute, or FSI, through the Foreign Service Act of 1946. The FSI was headed by the linguist Edward T.Hall. The Institute became the centre of cooperation of scholars, involved in various fields of research – anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, linguists etc. Their task was to work out new training programmes for specialists sent abroad. In other words, the CCC students put forward purely practical goals: to train diplomats, politicians, military men, Peace Corps volunteers and prepare them for a more effective performance abroad as well as to help foreign students and trainees to be successfully adapted to the USA lifestyle, to eradicate racial and ethnic conflicts that took place in the USA in the 60s of the 20th century.

Also, the scientists from the Institute carried out research into the causes of Peace Corps volunteers' failures. Their attempts to understand and explain the behaviour of people with different cultural backgrounds were based, however, on intuition rather than on knowledge and experience. Therefore, their research was not at first very effective. The main conclusion of the scientists was that every culture forms its own unique system of values, priorities, models of behaviour and therefore its description, interpretation and evaluation should be performed from the point of view of this particular culture, i.e. no culture is "correct" – rather, cultures are simply different and should be tolerated as such. This approach, called **cultural relativism**, however, raises many political and moral questions: if a culture is based on the oppression of a minority group, should we value that culture as much as one that is based on tolerance and freedom? Or, are we simply judging other cultures by standards that should not be applied to them? (The relativist views are opposed to the stage development theory, according to which each culture goes through a definite number of stages before getting to the stage, usually referred to as *civilization.* This approach implies that the top stage is achieved by North America and Europe, that is why it is called **Eurocentrism**).

The first stage of the Institute research was completed in 1965. The book by Edward Hall *The Silent Language* contained the main results and became a programme of the further development of the CCC theory. In his book, Hall not only convincingly proved the tightest bond between culture and communication but also stressed the need of investigation into cultural behavioural subsystems. Using the analogy be-

tween foreign language studies through studying grammatical categories, he believed that profound learning of other cultures should be carried out through learning practical knowledge and skills.

Hall's interpretation of culture and communication (i.e. *communication is culture, culture is communication*) was widely disputed in the USA. The intensity of the debates led to the appearance of special journals, *International and Intercultural Communication Annual* and *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. These journals were devoted to problems of communication, culture and language. It was then that the notions 'intercultural', 'cross-cultural' and 'multicultural' became established without being differentiated.

Hall arrived at the conclusion that communication with other peoples could be taught ("if culture may be studied, it may as well be taught"). This postulate means establishing CCC as a discipline of a separate training course. According to Hall, the main aim of CCC as science is researching practical needs of representatives of various cultures to make their communication successful. Hall was the first who considered communication as a type of activity that could be analysed, which made it possible for him to develop his communicative **theory of interactional cultural patterns**.

Hall's publications drew attention of other scientists from various countries. In diverse ways they drew on Hall's views. Soon, CCC itself developed several schools. One of them was headed by Kluckhohn and Strodbeck who put forward their methodology of culture research. These anthropologists have developed a taxonomy of cultural values that looks at culture as a response to social problems. They offer six dimensions, based on problems that all societies face but resolve differently, across which we can measure and compare cultures. These problems and their categories are:

> 1. How do we view the environment (natural and social worlds)?
> 2. How do we see relationships among people?
> 3. How do we posit ourselves in the world?
> 4. What is basic human nature?
> 5. How do we think about and use time?
> 6. How do we think about and use space? (for more details see p. 141–146)

In the middle of the 60s, the problems of CCC became the focus of attention in the University of Pittsburg in the USA. Drawing on the cultural aspect of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, the university scholars worked out the notions "perception" and "perceptual systems" considering them as mediators between culture and thought. The scholars insisted that language should be viewed as just one of the ways to establish and maintain similar perception between members of a certain cultural group [Singer 1971].

Meanwhile, the group of psychologists at the University of Illinois, headed by Harry C.Triandis, was concerned with (a) the links between behaviour and elements of subjective culture and (b) differences between individualistic and collectivist culture. His work focused on the implications of these links for social behaviour, personality, work behaviour, intergroup relations, prejudice, attitude change, and cultural training; and applications to intercultural training for successful interaction in other cultures.

The founders of another trend within CCC were Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter in *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, blurbed as "eye-opening" they explore how communication values and styles can be similar or different for members of various cultures and communities. The book focuses on practical strategies that can be used to communicate more effectively in a variety of contexts, including interpersonal, rhetoric, group, business, education, health care, and organizational.

The development of the CCC theory in the USA in the 60s-70s was complemented by new trends and aspects of research. One of them lay in studies of **adaptation** to foreign environment and the problem of **culture shock** (see M.Winkelman, M.Bennett).

Modern research into CCC in the USA develops within the following two trends: CCC as interaction of different cultures and CCC as interaction of subcultures within one large culture. The first trend is oriented to working out university programmes and staff training for overseas offices, while the second tries to solve problems of ethnic minorities and to establish ethnic pluralism in the USA. This division is preserved in American science up to the present moment.

2.2. Cross-cultural communication studies in Western Europe

While the study of cross-cultural communication is a long established field in the US and falls within the larger field of communication studies, European scientists got interested in CCC a little later than it happened in the United States. It should also be mentioned that Europe drew its attention to the CCC problems for absolutely different reasons. The first lark of this process was a symposium on international and cross-cultural communication between developed and developing countries, held in Berlin in 1966. Its organizers attempted to present to German science a new trend marked with practical value and to give new impulses for research. The initiative, however, did not get much response and did not meet its organizers' expectations.

It is only a decade later that Europe showed interest in issues of CCC, which is quite natural: the European community opened up borders of many states, which resulted in free circulation of people, capital and goods. European capitals and cities, flooded by representatives of different cultures, quickly started to change. Thus, it was life itself that brought up the problem of interaction of people with different cultural background.

The first tentative attempts to study cross-cultural communication were made by foreign language teachers who had to turn to culture studies during their classes. Some time later, problems of CCC were considered by psychologists who paid attention first of all to issues of value orientation, ethocultural identity, feeling of "otherness" in a foreign environment (see works by Hofstede).

Modern CCC studies in Germany have been developing since the late 1980s, when Juliana Roth, professor in intercultural communication, Munich University, and intercultural management, European Business School, pointed out that ethnography had not so far been involved in CCC research and cultural contacts in offices. Since that time on, German scientists started to investigate problems of acculturation, migration of foreign workers, relations between foreign and German employees. Different works put to the fore various aspects: perception, behaviour and language differences. The aim and the fo-

cus of research determined methods applied. Thus, scientists made use of hermeneutics, cognitive psychology, linguistics, ethnosemantics and ethnomethodology.

Ruth Wodak, professor of Applied Linguistics from Vienna University, who is currently Professor and Chair in Discourse Studies at Lancaster University, contributes to the development of theoretical approaches in discourse studies (combining ethnography, argumentation theory, rhetoric, and text linguistics), as well as organizational communication, identity politics, language and/in politics, racism, prejudice and discrimination.

Some Western European universities in the 1970s-1980s started to study CCC and introduced academic courses into their curricula, just like it happened in the USA. Drawing on American experience in CCC teaching, educational syllabi were worked out on the basis of folklore studies, ethnology and linguistics. It should be mentioned, however, that the theory of CCC as academic discipline is taught in Europe only in several universities. Moreover, the orientation and the content of courses are determined by the specialization of the department within which a corresponding chair is created. Thus, in the UK, cross-cultural communication studies is a sub-field of applied linguistics. Cross-cultural communication classes can be found within foreign language departments of some universities, while other schools are placing cross-cultural communication programmes in their department of education.

Meanwhile, current processes of globalization and European integration set up favorable conditions and make problems of multiculturality important in many European countries. The present demographic situation in Europe makes it possible to suppose that quite soon the theory of CCC will become a new inter-disciplinary trend as an academic and educational science.

2.3. Cross-cultural communication studies in Ukraine and Russia

In Ukrainian and Russian science and educational institutions, research into CCC was initiated by foreign language teachers, who were the first to realize that it is not enough to master a foreign lan-

guage in order to interact effectively with representatives of other cultures. Relatively recently, a number of Russian universities have introduced in their curricula a new subject – cross-cultural communication. The subject aims at helping students interact successfully with people of different cultural background on the everyday interpersonal level.

For the time being, cross-cultural communication as an independent scientific branch and academic discipline is just being established in Ukrainian and Russian universities. This subject is mainly included in the curricula of Linguistics departments. The content of the course embraces, first of all, general theoretical fundamentals of CCC as well as culture-specific issues of native speakers of the language. Naturally, the initiator and the leader in this process in Russia is the Foreign Language Department in Moscow University, where CCC has already been taught for several years. The department offers courses of lectures, organizes annual scientific conferences to share new results and findings, and publishes collections of articles on the problem (see, e.g. Межкультурная коммуникация. Сборник учебных программ. М., 1999; Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация. М., 2001; etc.). This initiative has been supported by other Russian higher educational institutions. Russian psychologists and sociologists are also involved in the research of CCC (see works by M.Y.Martynova, N.M.Lebedeva etc.).

In Ukraine, this process is slower, it does not have a regular character, only sporadically one comes across scientists investigating into this field (e.g. A.S.Baronin, A.D.Belova, F.S.Batsevych, P.N.Donets, P.T.Guseva, T.L.Katzbert, A.E.Levitsky, etc.). Lviv University of Ivan Franko can boast the Chair for Translation Studies and Intercultural Communication.

While the number of text-books published in Moscow on the problem of CCC shows quite convincingly the rapid development of CCC in Russian science (see works by T.G.Grushevitskaya, A.P.Sadokhin, V.V.Kabakchi, S.G.Ter-Minasova etc.), research into cross-cultural communication is just beginning in Ukrainian science.

The initial linguistic orientation of CCC studies in Ukraine and Russia resulted in the formation of several trends in research, rooted in linguistics. These are area studies, etholinguistics, and linguoculturology. Each of them is based on a corresponding aspect of language–culture interaction and, therefore, is important for the CCC theory as such.

Thus, area studies is oriented to research into language-culture inter-relation (see works by E.M. Vereshchegin, V.G. Kostomarov, G.D. Tomakhin). Ethnolinguistics looks into problems of interaction between language and various aspects of a people's life, the role of language in formation and functioning of folk culture, national psychology and art (see works by A.S. Gerd, M.M. Kopylenko, N.I. Tolstoy). Linguoculturology deals with the correlation between culture and language in their synchronic interaction (see works by V.V. Vorobyov, M.A. Kulinich, V.A. Maslova, V.N. Teliya) and concentrates on rituals, customs, beliefs, fixed in language, stereotypes, symbols and language signs, speech behaviour, speech etiquette, etc.

The mentioned branches of linguistics are aimed at studying national specific peculiarities of one culture taken in isolation. The results of their research are important for the CCC theory and practice, since they help to carry out comparative analysis of two and more cultures.

Besides the mentioned branches of CCC, there are other issues, i.e. types of communication that are no less important for CCC and are intensively investigated. Within the framework of communication studies, we cannot but mention the problems of verbal communication (see works by V.V.Bogdanov, L.O.Kamenskaya, E.F.Tarasova), correlation between consciousness and communication (see D.G.Gudkov, V.V.Krasnykh, V.Y.Shabes), communicative behaviour of a speaker (see T.G.Vinokur, I.S.Susov). Besides, the new tendency to describe communicative strategies and tactics as well as non-verbal communication adds to the CCC theory important information that may be further elaborated (see S.N. Gorelov, V.I. Karasik, Y.B. Kluyev, N.I. Formanovskaya, A.D. Belova, I.O. Rozmaritsa, L.V. Soloshchuk).

3. Modern trends in cross-cultural communication studies

As it has been already mentioned, the scholars of the US Foreign Service Institute were specialists in various fields and based their research on their branches, which imbued the CCC theory with eclectic colouring. Gradually, achievements of different scientific

branches have been integrated in an independent science with its own subject and methods. Dominating, however, became methods and theoretical fundamentals of folklore studies and ethnology. This laid the foundation of the two main trends in CCC research.

The first trend, based on folklore studies, is **descriptive**. Its goals are to reveal, describe and interpret people's everyday behaviour in order to explain hidden reasons and determining factors of their culture.

The second trend, of **cultural-anthropological** nature, is focused on various types of cultural activity, norms, rules and values maintained by social groups and communities. Social differentiation of a society encourages in each group its own patterns and rules of behaviour. Knowing them means coping with CC situations quickly and effectively.

Methodological instruments of other sciences (psychology, pedagogy, sociology, communication theory, etc.) are more restricted and depend on the subject of research. They are, as a rule, oriented to a certain aspect of CCC and more often than not are based on theoretical and methodological postulates of ethnology. The majority of scholars, involved in CCC research, regardless of their specialization and aspect of studies, agree on the following aims of the CCC research:

- to teach participants cultural perception as well as ability to correctly interpret concrete realizations of communicative behaviour and to develop in the participants tolerant attitude;
- to work out teaching methodology in order to train speakers to deal with representatives of different cultures.

Meanwhile, within American communication studies, one may distinguish the following three main approaches to CCC interpretation: **functionalist, interpretative** and **critical.**

Structural functionalism is a broad perspective in sociology and anthropology which sets out to interpret society as a structure with interrelated parts. Functionalism addresses society as a whole in terms of the function of its constituent elements; namely norms, customs, traditions and institutions. A common analogy, popularized by Herbert Spencer, presents these parts of society as "organs" that work toward the proper functioning of the "body" as a whole. The functionalist approach is based on psychological studies to describe and predict participants' be-

haviour. The supporters of this approach believe that human behaviour is predictable and communication is strongly influenced by culture. The main method within this approach is observation. The results of this approach permit to distinguish numerous cultural differences in many aspects of communication. This method, however, ignores the role of context in communication.

Interpretive approaches in cultural anthropology treat culture as "texts" to be understood through interpretation of their "deep structure". Culture is treated as "webs of meaning" to be understood through critical analysis. A key theorist who represents this approach is Clifford Geertz. The famous American anthropologist gave prime attention to the role of symbols in constructing public meaning. In his seminal work *The Interpretation of Cultures* (1973), Geertz outlines culture as "a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which people communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life" [Geertz 1973, p. 89]. Geertz believed the role of anthropologists was to try to interpret the guiding symbols of each culture. He was one of the earliest scholars to see that the insights provided by common language, philosophy and literary analysis could have major explanatory force in the social sciences.

The **critical approach** is based on the critical theory and focuses upon the implicit values expressed within anthropological studies, and on the unacknowledged biases that may result from such implicit values. Traditional anthropology tends to emphasize the researcher's role in controlling interactions in the field and in reporting their findings in a disengaged way. The critical approach examines the assumptions behind this methodology, and postulates that there can be other approaches besides the traditional; it interprets culture as struggling for power, thus, its proponents consider economic and political factors that influence culture and communication. According to this approach, all interaction forms are predetermined by power, exercised by participants. The method suggested within this trend of the CCC theory is text analysis ([Gupta, Ferguson 1997], see also works by Judith Martin and Thomas Nakayama).

In modern CCC research, there have appeared new objects of investigation: communication in the context of culture globalization, cultural imperialism, mass CC communication, including the Internet.

All the mentioned approaches and trends prove that there is an active investigation process. Yet, the theory still lacks systemic understanding of CCC. Everything is still stuck on the level of separate concepts and points of view. In order to work out holistic understanding of CCC, it is necessary to clarify theoretical and methodological premises of CCC research.

Reading and assignments

1. Read the extract from the seminal book by Edward T.Hall The Silent Language *and answer the questions that follow.*

Despite an occasionasl flurry of popular interest, anthropology (and the culture concept which is at its heart) was long associated in people's minds with subject matter and individuals who are far removed from the realities of the everyday world of business and politics. Though it still persists in some quarters, this viewpoint was at its strongest up until the time of the early 1930s.

The depression changed many things. (…) Anthropologists, for example, were suddenly called from their academic refuge and put to work trying to relieve some of the more pressing burdens of the nation's minority groups. (…) Up to this point it had been the government's policy to treat all the different tribes alike, as if they were ignorant and somewhat stubborn children – a mistake which is yet to be really rectified.

(…) Like the State Department's Foreign Service, the Indian Service transferred its employees from post to post so often that they could put in a lifetime of service without learning anything about the people they were administering. Under such conditions it was almost impossible to introduce the disturbing anthropological idea that the Indians were deeply and significantly different from European-Americans. (…)

In World War II many anthropologists such as myself were not only to work on various projects having to do with the natives of the Southwest Pacific but were even asked to deal with the Japanese. (…) If this rich experience taught us one thing it was that cul-

ture is more than mere custom that can be shed or changed like a suit of clothes. The people we were advising kept bumping their heads against an invisible barrier, but they did not know what it was. We knew that what they were up against was a completely different way of organizing life, of thinking, and of conceiving the underlying assumptions about the family and the state, the economic system, and even of mankind. The big problem was how to communicate this brute fact.

Apart from having problems with laymen who often did not really care about a definition of culture, we had certain anthropological difficulties in the field itself:

> • consistency of basic information (field workers would record their interpretations of what informants told then but their interpretations were quite different) = assumption: naively evolutionary view which classified most foreigners as "underdeveloped Americans".
>
> • lack of necessary concreteness. There is no way to *teach* culture in the same way language is taught. There was no basic unit of culture defined, even such distinguished anthropologists as A.K.Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn call for "empathy" in the investigator.

George L.Trager and I began our collaboration to develop a method of the analysis of culture. Our ultimate objectives included five basic steps.

> 1. To identify the building blocks of culture – what we later came to call the *isolates* of culture, akin to the notes in a musical score.
>
> 2. To tie these isolates into a biological base so that they could be compared among cultures. We also stipulated that this comparison be done in such a way that the conditions be repeatable at will. Without this, anthropology can lay no claim to being a science.
>
> 3. To build a body of data and a methodology that would enable us to conduct research and teach each cultural situation in much the same way the language is taught without having to depend upon such qualities as "empathy" in the researcher.

4. To build a unified theory of culture that would lead us to further research.

5. Finally, to find a way to make our discipline tangibly useful to the non-specialist.

This book treats culture in its entirety as a form of communication. (…)

If this book has a message it is that we must learn to understand the "out-of-awareness" aspects of communication. We must never assume that we are fully aware of what we communicate to someone else.

Culture hides much more than it reveals, and strangely enough what it hides, it hides most effectively from its own participants. Years of study have convinced me that the real job is not to understand foreign culture but to understand our own. [Hall 1990, p. 22–29]

- *What problems in anthropological research does Hall point out and try to eliminate?*
- *What modern phenomena stimulate cross-cultural studies?*
- *Why does Hall argue that to understand one's own culture is more important than to understand foreign cultures?*

2. Read the extracts from the book by Anna Wierzbicka "Meaning and Culture". What do the texts illustrate? Think of other examples of these processes/ phenomena.

1) Air traffic controllers and pilots need to communicate with each other everywhere in the world, and the effectiveness of their communication is a matter of life and death for the passengers as well as the crew. The principal medium of this communication is English. Often, communication between pilots and controllers fails, resulting in runway incursions, unauthorized takeoffs and landings, and, most dire of all, midair collisions. Often, failures of communication that lead to tragic results involve non-native speakers of English.

For example, a recent paper entitled "Miscommunication between Pilots and Air Traffic Control" noted that "Aeroflot planes have started to land on a city street in Seattle and a highway in Israel. . . . Under a Hindi controller, a Kazakh airplane collided in midair [in

1996] with a Saudi plane. There were 349 deaths. . . . A New York crash in 1990 . . . was the direct consequence of incorrect wording by the Spanish-speaking copilot. . . . In a recent case . . . the last words of a Chinese pilot recorded on the cockpit voice recorder were 'What does pull up mean?'"

One of the most famous aviation disasters of recent times was the runway collision at the Canary Islands in 1977 between a KLM Boeing 747 and a Pan American Airways B-747, which killed 583 people. The disaster was due directly to the nonnative use of English by the Dutch pilot, who radioed: "We are now at takeoff," translating this expression literally from Dutch and meaning, "We are now beginning to take off." The controller, however, assumed that the plane was merely ready for takeoff and would await further instructions, so he said "OK" (adding: "stand by for takeoff.. . . I will call you"). The pilot heard "OK," so he continued rolling down the runway and collided with the Pan Am plane, which, invisible in the thick fog, was already on the same runway.

As emphasized in a recent report of the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), "Effective and accurate communications are crucial to air safety. As aircrafts approach their destination airport, they converge and operate under reduced separation minima. . . . Under these circumstances, there is little margin for error" (Koenig 1997, 8).

Aviation writers who discuss the tragic costs of miscommunication between pilots and controllers sometimes despair of English as a language of international aeronautical communication. For example, Jones (2003, 244) writes: "The standard form of speech of aviation . . . must be superior to any given variety of English in the clarity of its spoken form. . . . Perhaps here there is a practical solution in Esperanto. . . . The inability of English to express specific instructions to pilots without confusion would seem to disqualify it as a language for permanent use by aviation."

The hope that Esperanto could serve international aviation better than English scarcely seems realistic. But the case of aviation highlights the globalized world's need for a standardized international language. [Wierzbicka 2006, p. 304]

2) *Communication vibes*

According to a recent article in the *Christian Science Monitor* (Baldauf 2004), the fastest growing language in India is Hinglish, spoken by an estimated 350 million people – a language that "may soon claim more native speakers worldwide than English." The article cites as typical a Pepsi advertisement, "Yeh Dil Maange More" ("the heart wants more"), and Coke's "Life ho to aisi" ("life should be like this"), which have replaced earlier English-language advertisements like "Ask for more." The article cites the head of the creative division of Publicis India, an advertising firm, as saying, if you use English, "you may be understood but not vibed with. That's why all the multinational companies now speak Hinglish in their ads."

The importance of "vibes" in human communication is widely recognized in the literature on the world's new Englishes and post-Englishes: Hinglish, Singlish (from "Singapore English" or "Sri Lankan English"), Pringlish (from "Puerto Rican English"), and so on. It is seldom recognized, however, in the literature on "international English" or on "English as a lingua franca." On the contrary, it is often assumed that the main (if not sole) goal of English used as a tool of intercultural communication is to convey information, that the "pragmatics" of language use are not relevant in this case; and that Anglo conversational norms and conventions are (or should be) irrelevant in English-based cross-cultural exchanges.

The people who are least likely to be aware of the importance of Anglo norms in English-based intercultural communication seem to be 'Anglos' themselves. Ron Scollon and Suzanne Wong Scollon's *Intercultural Communication* (2001, 135–136) contains a nicely illustrative vignette in which two businessmen, one American and the other Chinese, meet on a plane from Tokyo to Hong Kong and strike up a conversation:

Mr. Richardson: By the way, I'm Andrew Richardson. My friends call me Andy. This is my business card.
Mr. Chu: I'm David Chu. Pleased to meet you, Mr. Richardson. This is my card.
Mr. Richardson: No, no. Call me Andy. I think we'll be doing a lot of business together.
Mr. Chu: Yes, I hope so.

Mr. Richardson (reading Mr. Chu's card): "Chu, Hon-fai." Hon-fai, I'll give you a call tomorrow as soon as I get settled at my hotel.

Mr. Chu (smiling): Yes. I'll expect your call.

Commenting on this encounter, the Scollons point out that there is in American business a preference for "close, friendly, egalitarian relationships," linked with the use of first names. By contrast, in Chinese culture, new business acquaintances would prefer a mutual use of titles and a certain initial reserve. In particular, a Chinese given name (in this case Hon-fai) would never be used by a stranger. If a given name is to be used at all (in a cross-cultural encounter), it should be Mr. Chu's Western name, David. As a result, Mr. Chu is embarrassed, and he smiles to cover up his embarrassment. His smile is misinterpreted by Mr. Richardson as an indicator that "he will be friendly and easy to do business with" (Scollon and Scollon 2001, 135–136). Thus: When these two men separate, they leave each other with very different impressions of the situation. Mr. Richardson is very pleased to have made the acquaintance of Mr. Chu and feels they have gotten off to a very good start. . . . In contrast, Mr. Chu feels quite uncomfortable with Mr. Richardson. He feels it will be difficult to work with him, and that Mr. Richardson might be rather insensitive to cultural differences.

The Scollons explain the cultural differences involved by using expressions like "symmetrical solidarity," "symmetrical deference," "involvement strategies," and "independence strategies." Since, however, these expressions are tied to technical English, and have no equivalents in either Mandarin or Cantonese, their commentary might be said itself to contain an element of Anglo bias (see Goddard 2002a, 2004b, in press, on "terminological ethnocentrism"). Although the authors show the importance of cross-cultural training for both Anglo and non-Anglo speakers of English, their generalizations are themselves culture-bound (as well as language-bound). By contrast, if we rely on simple and universal concepts like "good" and "bad," "know" and "say," or "when" and "if," their insights into cross-cultural differences can be formulated in a universally teachable form. To see how this can be done in relation to Chinese cultural norms, see Ye (2004; see also Yoon 2004).

I first illustrate this with an example drawn from another work by the same authors (Scollon and Scollon 1983), this time concerned with intercultural communication within America itself between Anglo-Americans and Athabascans (in Alaska). The Scollons call the former of the two groups "English speakers," but in fact the table partially reproduced here (Table 9.1) refers to two groups of English speakers: Anglo and Athabascan.

Perceptions like those reproduced in Table 9.1 point to different cultural scripts that the speakers themselves are not fully aware of. Noticing that the Athabascans behave differently, the Anglos judge them in accordance with Anglo scripts, which they take for granted, and vice versa. Not surprisingly, as a result each group forms a negative view of the other (e.g., "they talk too much"; "they talk too little"). (…)

What's confusing to English speakers about Athabaskan speakers	What's confusing to Athabaskan speakers about English speakers?
They do not speak They keep silent They avoid situations of talking They only want to talk to close acquaitances They deny planning They avoid direct questions They never start a conversation	They talk too much They always talk first They talk to strangers or people they don't know They think they can predict the future They always talk about what's going to happen later They ask too many questions

Communication between Anglo Americans and Athabaskans may seem to be an exotic case, far removed from problems arising in communication between, for example, Arabs, Americans, Russians, and Indonesians, but in fact the same issue is involved in all such cases. The differences in the unconscious cultural assumptions that underlie cross-cultural misperceptions and misunderstandings cannot be efficiently explained to all parties without a neutral cultural notation – a culturally neutral lingua franca for comparisons and explanations.

Andy Kirkpatrick (2004) proposes as an auxiliary language of intercultural communication a "Lingua Franca English" (LFE), which speakers with different mother tongues and different cultural back-

grounds can all speak according to their own native norms, understanding each other by virtue of goodwill and mutual tolerance, without any "standard monolithic norms" (In this way, "Lingua Franca English becomes the property of all and it will be flexible enough to reflect the cultural norms of those who use it". According to Kirkpatrick, the use of various local cultural norms by speakers of LFE need not be a problem: "I think it is inevitable and desirable that speakers will transfer some of the pragmatic norms of their L1 [first language] to Lingua Franca English".

But what will happen in a case where the "pragmatic" or cultural norms of different speakers are in conflict—for example, where one interlocutor's cultural background encourages him or her to express requests to equals or superiors in the form of a naked imperative ("Do this!" "Go there!" "Bring me that!"), whereas another regards such bare imperatives as an intolerable assault on their personal autonomy (…)?

What the NSM-based [*NSM – Natural Semantic Metalanguage – I.A.*] theory of cultural scripts offers for such situations is the prospect of intercultural training in the form of culture-specific cultural scripts that can be written in the English (as well as any other) version of the natural semantic metalanguage and that can be easily taught to speakers of any background. For example:

A Russian cultural script
[people think like this:]
when I feel (think) something
I can say to other people what I feel (think)
it will be good if someone else knows what I feel (think)
A Malay cultural script
[people think like this:]
when I feel (think) something
I can't always say to other people what I feel (think)
it will be good if I think about it before I say it

The language in which these scripts are written—the English version of NSM—can serve as an auxiliary language for teaching intercultural communication: being culturally neutral itself, it can be used effectively as a cultural notation for comparing languages and cultures. Crucially, explanations formulated in the English

NSM can be readily translated into any other language, for example, into Russian or Malay.

They can be taught through the words of any language the rudiments of which the interlocutors share. If interactants share a hundred (or even sixty or so) simple English words, cultural scripts of any other culture can be explained to them through those simple words (provided, of course, that they share the right ones, that is, the minilexicon of NSM).

"Good vibes" cannot always be achieved in intercultural communication, but many bad vibes can be avoided if the participants receive intercultural training. To be effective, this training must help the trainees learn about their own cultural scripts, as well as those of their culturally different interlocutors. Given the realities of the world today, it is particularly important for both the insiders and the outsiders that the cultural scripts of Anglo English be identified in an intelligible and readily translatable form.[Wierzbicka 2006, p. 305–308]

CHAPTER II
Culture and Its Aspects

1. Notion of "culture"

In modern Humanities, "culture" is one of the fundamental notions. It is difficult to find a more popular term, used not only in everyday language but in different sciences. Besides, among a great number of scientific categories and terms, one can hardly find a term with more meanings and semantic nuances occurring in various contexts.

Culture is researched by many humanitarian sciences, each of which distinguishes a certain aspect of culture and, correspondingly, defines the term from a relevant point of view. Diversity of approaches is natural since culture is polyfunctional. Thus, culture is studied by semiotics, sociology, history, anthropology, axiology, linguistics, ethnology, etc.

Culture is infinite and inexhaustible, that is why to define culture, to understand its essence is very difficult, it is not liable to a rigid scientific definition. Modern culture studies offer above 400 definitions of culture, none of which is full and exhaustive. Granted all the diversity of definitions, they have one thing in common: they indicate that the main and central subject and object of culture is human being.

Among definitions, one can find such metaphorical ones as, for example, given by Raymonde Carroll:

"Indeed, my culture is the logic by which I give order to the world. And I have been learning this logic little by little, since the moment I was born, from the gestures, the words, and the care of those who surrounded me; from their gaze, from the tone of their voices; from the noises, the colors, the smells, the body contact; from

the way I was raised, rewarded, punished, held, touched, washed, fed; from the stories I was told, from the books I read, from the songs I sang; in the street, at school, at play; from the relationships I witnessed between others, from the judgments I heard, from the aesthetics embodied everywhere, in all things right down to my sleep and the dreams I learned to dream and recount. I learned to breathe this logic and to forget that I had learned it. I find it natural. Whether I produce meaning or apprehend it, it underlies my interactions. This does not mean that I must agree with all those who share my culture: I do not necessarily agree with all those who speak the same language as I do. But as different as their discourse may be from mine, it is for me familiar territory, it is recognizable. The same is true, in a certain sense, of my culture." [Carroll 1988, p. 3]

Here, the notion "culture" is seen through the individual's perspective. The criteria of "ordering the world" are socially-meaningful phenomena such as language, gestures, upbringing methods and assessment that sometimes remain unconscious but influence latently many spheres of human life. It should be stressed that culture may not be seen, heard, felt or tasted.

It may only be observed in its separate realizations, i.e. in differences in human behaviour, in certain types of activity, rituals, traditions, material things, etc. A human is able to register only isolated elements of culture but is not capable of seeing it as a whole. Observing the meanings of various cultural elements, one may have no difficulty in concluding that they are grounded on cultural differences. Stating this fact brings about interest in culture and stimulates its research.

In general, there may be distinguished the following methodological approaches to culture in Western studies:

> • *sociological*, where culture is treated as factor of social life organization, as unity of ideas, principles, social institutes securing collective human life. Culture is a phenomenon that defines the social aspect of human personality from the point of view of acquired behaviour. Culture is dynamic just like personality, they both change due to circumstances and time [Stark 2007; Griswold 2004];

• *historical*, where culture is a product of social history and develops through passing on acquired experience from generation to generation. Here, culture is a result of joint activity; its main components are a distinct group of people and definite history of their existence. Culture determines ways with the help of which various societies standardize and canonize approved behavioural patterns as well as methods by means of which their culture rejects certain patterns of behaviour [Walton 1988];

• *normative* that claims that cultural content is norms and rules prescribing people's actions. Culture is a set of artificial orders and objects created by people in addition to laws of nature, learned forms of human behaviour and activity, acquired knowledge, symbolic signs of the world. In other words, culture is a system of socially acquired behaviour patterns that enables people to interact with the world. It develops in time and evolves permanently, though slowly [Fatehi 1996];

• *psychological* based on correlation between culture and psychology of human behaviour. Culture is a way of life, the context where we live, think, feel and communicate with each other. It is the "glue" that joins people in a group. It is a programme installed from early childhood that determines human behaviour in a society and helps to understand what they are expected to do and what happens if these expectations are not met. Culture may be defined as ideas, customs, skills, methods and devices characteristic of a certain group in a certain period [Richard-Amato, Snow 1992];

• *didactic* that treats culture as set of qualities that a human being acquires through learning and that are not inherited genetically. Culture consists of ideas, values and worldview peculiar to people and determining their behaviour. Culture is learned from childhood and passed on from generation to generation [Brislin 1993];

• *anthropological* that treats culture as patterns of feeling, thinking, and acting that people in the same social

environment share and which set them apart from people of a different social environment. Culture in this meaning can be defined as the "software of mind" (the metaphor, suggested by Hofstede in 1991), the set of mental rules that govern our everyday behaviour.

Culture as subject of cultural anthropology is sufficiently deeply studied. Yet, one cannot but mention at least two schools in anthropology that emphasize two aspects of culture. **Cognitive anthropology** views culture as knowledge, as the sum total of the information, beliefs, values and skills one needs to share and apply in the society [Riley 1989]. Thus, people of the same culture

know that
- what is believed to be true. This includes their political and religious philosophies, their "theories" of disease, education, physics, child bearing, hunting, history, geography, etc. (relatively permanent background knowledge);
know of
- current events and preoccupations. In other words, people know what is going on in the society in question (relatively ephemeral background knowledge);
know how
- skills and competencies. People are aware how to act, how to behave appropriately (how to use the telephone, dance, choose a spouse) and how to speak (how to thank, greet, tell a story, address a superior), i.e. communicative competence.

All in all, proponents of cognitive anthropology treat culture as system of knowledge, i.e. as mental categories of individuals. One of the most well-known representatives of this approach, W.Goodenough, argues that culture is not a material phenomenon: it does not consist of things, people, behaviour or emotions. It is rather a form to organize it all. It is a form people imply, it is a model of their perception and comprehension, relation and its interpretation [Goodenough 1957].

The distinct feature of the second anthropological school, **cultural anthropology**, is its interpretative nature. It aims to study everyday life of comparatively small groups and communities. Here cul-

ture is viewed as based on certain norms and rules that regulate all aspects of social life. One may distinguish the following characteristics of culture:

- culture is a universal phenomenon of human life that is why there is no human community or social group without their culture;
- culture is a product of joint activity of people;
- culture is expressed in values, rules, customs and rituals;
- culture is not inherited genetically but is learned;
- different populations of people have created different ethnic, regional, social cultures;
- culture is dynamic, it is able to develop and innovate, to create new forms and ways of meeting human interests and needs;
- culture results from people's collective activity but its bearers are separate individuals;
- culture is the foundation of self-identification of a society and its members, realization of its bearers, of their group and individual Ego, differentiation between "our" and "other" in interactions with other cultures and peoples.

Thus, the main goal of cultural anthropology is to observe, register, describe and interpret everyday behaviour of people in order to find an explanation of its causes and possible consequences. Here culture is defined as all types of activity rather than physiological results (products of human species having nothing to do with reflexes or instincts). It means, speaking the language of biology and physiology, that culture consists of conditioned reflexes and types of activities, acquired through learning as well as their products. The idea of learning returns us to what is socially transmitted, i.e. is passed down through traditions, what is acquired by the individual as a member of a society [Kroeber, Kluckhohn 1952].

Cultural anthropology sees culture as product of human collective activity, a system of ways of collective co-existence, systematized norms and rules to satisfy various group and individual needs. A culture is produced as a result of long co-existence of people on a certain territory. Their collective economic activity and protection from external

attacks form their common outlook, common lifestyle, communicative style, clothing, cuisine, etc. As a result, there appears a new cultural system, called "culture of this people". But every ethnic culture is not just a sum of all activities of a people. Its core is made up of "rules of the game", formed in the process of co-existence.

The "rules" are not genetically inherited but are learned. Despite its obviously objective nature, culture is an abstract notion, as in reality it exists only together with cultures of various epochs and regions, inside these epochs.

Local cultures – cultures of separate countries and peoples – are a form of existence of human culture. Local cultures produce a system of communication, maintain different styles and types of behaviour, value systems, preserve ethnic specific features. Cross-cultural communication takes place both by means of conflicts, wars as well as mutual adaptation and understanding of cultural uniqueness of neighbours. As a rule, the nature of CCC is determined by the degree of closeness and kinship of cultures. In other words, some local cultures resemble each other due to their genetic kinship and living conditions. Other cultures are strikingly different. Each culture embodies specific experience gained by a historical community from social practice. This experience imbues each culture with its unique features, determines its peculiarities. The uniqueness may be manifested in various aspects of human activity: in ways to satisfy biological, material or spiritual needs, in types of behaviour, clothing and housing, types of tools, etc.

Thus, the main components of human culture are local cultures, whose bearers are peoples that have created them. Each people is an independent ethnic community. Ethnic communities consist of several generations. People get united into a community due to various reasons, including their history, common traditions, etc. but the main uniting factors are common territory and language.

Peculiarity of a culture results in a cultural worldview. Cultural pictures of the world are produced by different world perception, since people of different cultures perceive, feel and see the world in a specific way and create their own image of the world, i.e. collective representation of the world, called **worldview**. *The cultural world-*

view is a set of rational knowledge and ideas of values, norms, mentality of one's own culture and other peoples' cultures.

The cultural worldview is expressed in different attitudes to cultural phenomena. For example, on Madagascar, funerals reveal the status and the degree of respect other people have for the deceased. As a result, some funerals are attended by thousands of people and some – by only few. With some peoples, funerals may last for weeks. In modern Ukraine and the USA, funerals take only several hours. Different attitudes to similar events may be explained only by differences of their cultural worldviews where the event has different value and meaning.

As to the issue of **formation of human culture**, studies show that animals' behaviour is based on the same principles as that of people. Namely, behaviour of people and animals show many similar factors – far more than it used to be supposed. This enables us to claim that humans are just one of species in the biosphere, that is why human behaviour reveals many biological laws.

According to these laws, any living being has to adapt to the environment. Animals have instincts that regulate their behaviour at any moment of their lives. Some animals, living in relatively stable and unchangeable environment, act in keeping with rigidly programmed ways and rules. Others, living in an ever-changing environment, have to deviate from standards and choose one of several behavioural alternatives. In any case an animal knows how to act, the world of its perception and the world of its practical actions are interdependent.

Unlike animals, a human is deprived of a set of instincts. Even to satisfy the needs as a living organism, a human is not tightly bound with strictly prescribed requirements, since human activity is based mainly on consciousness. It means that the human world of perception and the human world of actions are divided by social conditions. Therefore, people may easily find themselves in a situation where they have no idea how to act and what to do. In order to get adapted to the environment, humans have to create their artificial worlds – the second nature that consists of material things, values, behavioural patterns, symbols of consciousness, etc. This new nature is created not only as human environment. By creating material and spiritual things and phenomena, people create themselves. As a result, people

appear as product of their own history, activity, consciousness. In fact, human culture and cultural environment is a specific way of adaptation to the physical and biological environment. Customs, conventional norms, necessary to survive and develop, are passed down from generation to generation. This is how culture stores, facilitates and protects human life, establishing models of interaction with nature, with other people and with one's self.

2. Socialization and Enculturation

2.1. Socialization

A human is social by nature that is why social integration is an extremely important factor in human life. Every person has to adapt to the society, otherwise the person cannot co-exist with people and will be doomed to isolation and solitude. In order to avoid this, a person from early childhood learns conventional patterns of behaviour and patterns of thought and in such a way enters the environment. Anyone's individual development starts with their involvement in sociocultural reality. This entering the world takes place through acquisition of a necessary quantity of knowledge, norms, values, behaviour patterns that make a person a full-right member of the society.

Socialization is a continuing process whereby an individual acquires a personal identity and learns the norms, values, and social skills appropriate to his or her social position. The need of socialization is conditioned biologically and stems from genetic peculiarities. Almost all animals are genetically programmed to certain standards of behaviour. The higher the status, taken by a species on the evolution ladder, the more behaviour patterns its representatives have to acquire through communication with their parents and other members of the population. Still, animals genetically inherit a considerable part of vital behaviour patterns.

Unlike animals, humans are not programmed for complex behaviour. They are born with quite a limited inherited set of the simplest behaviour patterns. They are minimal for survival during the first

years of their lives. Human beings have to learn the rest in the process of communication with other people. Complexity of human skills and behaviour patterns determines a continuous and multi-faceted process of socialization. For example, animals need from several hours to some weeks to learn acoustic signals, whereas it takes humans several years to learn their native tongue.

The term "socialization" was introduced in the 40s of the 20th century, though the problem of socialization had been worked out in philosophy, psychology and sociology before. In the 18th century, philosophers of the Enlightenment, who considered a human a product of social environment, lay the foundation of the notion of socialization.

In modern science, the initiative to study socialization belongs to Emile Durkheim who saw human development as transformation of social norms, traditions, ideas into elements of the individual's inner world. We become recognizably human by being initiated into a society. As Durkheim puts it, "Man is man, in fact, only because he lives in a society". Becoming socialized is the process of being fitted into a complex social environment. Social life is not merely concerned with the basic necessities of physical existence and the regulating mores of the group, but also with what we call our culture. Nor is it merely crude information that is passed on in socializing, but also how that knowledge and those skills and understandings are to be interpreted. Durkheim argues that "society frequently finds it necessary that we should see things from a certain angle and feel them in a certain way".

The interest in socialization was growing and, gradually, it became the subject of such disciplines as behaviourism, cognitivism, phenomenology, etc. For CCC, the most valuable research has been carried out by representatives of **symbolic interactionism** that places emphasis on micro-scale social interaction. One of the most outstanding scientists of this school is the American sociologist George Herbert Mead. According to his viewpoint, people in a society take different positions in relations with each other and in social institutes. Every such position is a social role that requires its bearer to maintain a certain type of behaviour and perform certain functions. Social roles are infinitely various, they may be interpersonal, routine, official, intergroup, etc. Mastering these roles is, in fact, a process of socialization [Mead 2011].

Besides, socialization, according to interactionists, also includes learning symbols. Gestures, language, tone, clothing and many others become symbolic in human interaction. Understanding these symbols constitutes another aspect of socialization.

Getting information about the most diverse aspects of social life, the individual is formed as personality, socially and culturally adequate for the society. Interacting with various institutes and organizations, the individual accumulates ever-growing experience and knowledge of socially approved behaviour. Thus, the individual harmoniously enters the social environment, learns the system of socio-cultural values, which enables the individual to function as full-right citizen.

Socialization is, on the one hand, acquisition of norms, behaviour patterns, views, stereotypes, characteristic of the individual's family and the closest environment. This acquisition occurs, as a rule, unconsciously, through imitation, uncritical acknowledgement of dominating stereotypes. The other aspect of socialization is acquisition of necessary knowledge and skills in the process of interaction with social institutes, created both for the sake of the individual's socialization (school, college, etc.) and those that fulfill socializing functions together with their main functions (office, public organizations, clubs of various kinds, etc.).

Besides, an important factor of socialization is influence of ethnic and group subcultures. Socialization in a certain culture has its peculiarities that may be divided into the following two groups: *vital* (*biological*) and *mental* (*spiritual*).

Vital peculiarities are certain ways of feeding children, taking care of them, their physical development, etc. Mental features of socialization are ethnic norms of communication that determine communicative styles between the elder and the young, age distance, mutual perception of different age groups. At the same time, mental features are also important in formation of cross-cultural relations that appear in childhood and are preserved for a long time, becoming stereotypes.

Comparative CC research shows that different societies and cultures appreciate different personal traits. Formation and development of traits, viewed as positive in a society, occur, as a rule, through their purposeful cultivation, i.e. transfer of norms, rules and patterns of appropriate be-

haviour from older generation to young generation. Every people has formed its own ways to transfer social experience to children. Ethnographers and sociologists compare *parenting styles* in different cultures and tend to distinguish such opposite approaches as Japanese and English (see works by Mead, Eriksson).

In Japan, parents try to use methods of encouragement rather than punishment. To bring up a child in Japan means foreseeing bad behaviour and teaching the right behaviour rather than scolding for wrongdoings. Even in case of obvious violations of rules, a parent avoids direct disapproval in order not to humiliate a child. Instead of being blamed, Japanese children are taught concrete behaviour patterns and are assured that they are capable of controlling themselves. Japanese tradition of upbringing is based on the belief that extreme pressure on children's psyche may lead to the opposite result.

If one assesses Japanese parenting style from the point of view of a European, one will conclude that children are incredibly pampered. They are not prohibited anything during their first years of life. Parents protect them from crying. Adults absolutely ignore their children's misbehaviour. The first restrictions appear only in school years but even then they are introduced gradually. Only from the age of six or seven a Japanese child starts to subdue his/her impulses, starts to learn to behave, to respect adults, duty and to be devoted to the family. As one gets older, behaviour becomes ever more regulated.

In England, socialization of children is based on completely different principles. An English parent believes that excessive expression of parental affection and tenderness spoils children's temper. According to English pedagogical principles, to pamper children means spoiling them (cf. the English saying *spare the rod, spoil the child*). It is maintained that children must be treated in a reserved, even cold way. Misbehaviour should be severely punished. From early childhood, a young English generation is taught to be independent and responsible for their actions. Children grow up early, they don't have to adjust to adult life in any special way. Consciously distancing from children, parents prepare them for difficulties in their further adult life. At the age of 16–17, having got a school certificate, children leave their parents' home and live separately.

2.2. Enculturation

Lately, a number of humanitarian sciences have been using the term "*enculturation*" defined as *process by which a person learns the requirements of the culture by which he or she is surrounded, and acquires values and behaviours that are approapriate or necessary in that culture*. If successful, enculturation results in competence in the language, values and rituals of the culture. The process of enculturation begins from birth, i.e. from acquisition of the first behaviour skills and speech. Enculturation lasts a lifetime. This process includes formation of fundamental human skills such as communication with other people, control over one's own behaviour and emotions, ways to satisfy one's needs, evaluative attitude to various phenomena. The final result of enculturation is cultural competence in language, values, customs.

Stages of enculturation. The founder of research into enculturation, the American culture scientist Melville Herskovits emphasized that enculturation and socialization occur simultaneously and that without entering the culture the individual cannot be a member of a society [Herskovits : 1967]. Herskovits distinguished between the two stages of enculturation, whose unity at group level secures normal functioning and development of a culture.

The matter is that every individual has to pass certain stages in life. These are stages of a life cycle: childhood, adolescence, middle age and old age. Each stage of the life cycle is characterized by its own results in enculturation. Thus, one may distinguish between the following main stages of enculturation – *initial (primary)* – from childhood to adolescence – and *adult (secondary)* – from middle age to old age.

The *primary stage* starts from birth and lasts throughout teen years. Its main content is upbringing and learning. This is the period when children learn the most vital elements of culture, acquire skills, necessary for normal socio-cultural life. The process of enculturation is realized by means of purposeful upbringing and partially through practical experience. Each culture offers special ways of forming in children adequate knowledge and skills. Usually, it occurs in games of various types. Games are a universal means of enculturation, since they perform several functions at a time:

> • *teaching*, i.e. development of such skills as memory, attention, perception of information;

- *communicative*, i.e. orientation to unite diverse community into a collective and to establish interpersonal emotional relations;
- *entertaining*, i.e. creation of favourable atmosphere in communication;
- *relaxing*, i.e. elimination of emotional tension, caused by stresses on a nervous system in various activities;
- *developing*, i.e. harmonious development of the individual's psychic and physiological traits;
- *upbringing*, i.e. mastering meaningful norms and principles of behaviour in concrete situations.

All adults have happened to observe situations when little children play on their own, paying no attention to others. Initially, they tend to play alone. From the age of two, they start copying other children and adults' behaviour, without establishing any contact. It is a so-called *parallel play* – a form of play where children play next to each other, but do not try to influence one another's behaviour. An observer will notice that they occasionally see what the other is doing and then modify their play accordingly. At the age of three, children start to interact with others in their play and there may be fleeting cooperation. Children develop friendship and the preferences for playing with some but not all other children. This is an *associate play*. And finally, at four years, children are capable of *cooperative play*, i.e. a child plays together with shared aims of play with others. Play may be quite difficult and children are supportive of others in their play.

Acquisition of labour skills and formation of attitude to labour, development of aptitude for learning are exceptionally important for this stage. The attitude to labour, for example, is culturally specific: labour may be perceived as God's punishment, as burden, as something inappropriate for a dignified person (which was typical in Western Europe in the ancient and feudal times, and is still true for Eastern countries). On the other hand, labour may be seen as God's trial, as something next to sacred – the attitude, typical of capitalist Western Europe (for more details see famous *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* by Maximilian Carl Emil Weber). One may claim that it is the time when an adult person is formed, a person, capable of adequate participation in socio-cultural life.

Methods of primary enculturation depend on the gender of a teacher. Women usually try to be tender, to influence through encouragement and approval, turn a blind eye on whims and weak points. Men, on the contrary, tend to experience emotional discomfort in close contact with a child and therefore resort to threats, punishment and require discipline. Mother's care develops in a child emotional dependence on adults. Father, due to encouragement of military games and physical exercise, develops in a child independence and readiness to act. Thus, primary identification also lays the foundation of gender identity.

The *secondary stage* is associated with adults, since entering a culture is not over at 18. At this stage, enculturation is fragmentary and is realized from time to time only as mastering of certain cultural elements. These elements are usually some inventions or discoveries that change human life dramatically or new ideas, borrowed from other cultures.

A distinctive feature of the secondary enculturation stage is development of human ability to independenteg master one's of socio-cultural environment within boundaries, accepted in the society. A human may combine acquired knowledge and skills to solve his/her own problems. This ability to take decisions, important for him/her as well as for other people, is extended: the individual is entitled to participate in actions that may bring about considerable socio-cultural changes.

At this stage, professional skills are extremely important. They take most time and effort. Skills and qualification are acquired in secondary and higher educational establishments. This stage is also characterized by mastering new roles in the family, elaboration of social contacts, creation of a new social status, accumulation of own life experience.

Mechanisms of enculturation. Every human has to master a number of social roles, since socialization and enculturation last a lifetime. Each social role requires implementation of a number of cultural norms, rules and stereotypes of behaviour. Up to the old age, the individual modifies his/her views on life, habits, tastes, patterns of behaviour, roles, etc. All these modifications occur as a result of influence of the individual's socio-cultural environment, without which enculturation is impossible.

Modern research into enculturation uses the notion of *cultural transmission*, i.e. *mechanism to transmit socio-cultural information within a group to its new members or generations.* Scholars tend to differentiate between the following three ways of cultural transmission:

- *vertical*, i.e. information, values, skills, etc. are transmitted from parents to children;
- *horizontal*, i.e. cultural experience and customs are transmitted from peers to peers;
- *indirect*, i.e. the individual gets necessary socio-cultural information through learning from adult relatives, neighbours, teachers, as well as specialized institutes of enculturation (schools, colleges, etc.).

At different stages of life, the methods of cultural transmission are of different importance. Up to three years, the leading role is played by a family, especially mother. Unlike other mammals who get adapted to independent life quite quickly, human young need care of other people, who feed, protect them, etc. Therefore, relations with parents, siblings, and relatives in general are essential at the early stage of enculturation. It should be noted, though, that whereas in cultures of European peoples the main agents of socialization and enculturation are parents, in traditional communities, upbringing is a matter of the whole community.

At the age of three to 15, enculturation of a child consists of such important components as communication with peers, school, contacts with new people. This is the period when children learn to operate with things in order to achieve a concrete practical result. They get to know signs and symbols, later on – notions, learn to create abstract and ideal images. On the basis of the feeling of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, they develop their emotional sphere. In such a way, the surrounding society and culture gradually become the only possible world with which one identifies oneself.

The ***instruments of enculturation*** are imitation, identification, guilt and shame.

Imitation is children's deliberate willingness to copy adults' patterns of behaviour. As a rule, the objects of imitation are parents, but children may also try to emulate teachers, famous people, etc. A

child imitates not only concrete actions or operations, such as table manners, but also more complex actions taught by parents.

Identification is the way of learning parents' behaviour, values as if they were their own. Children actively learn peculiarities of their parents and close people.

Imitation and identification are positive tools of enculturation. Unlike them, guilt and shame are negative psychological intruments of enculturation.

Shame is an emotion, caused by negative evaluation of a certain action given by the individual him/herself or by other people. It occurs in cases when the individual is caught red-handed, or gets exposed.

Guilt is also an emotion caused by internal remorses for committing a socially condemned action. In fact, guilt is an act of self-punishment, a product of the individual's conscience.

3. Culture and Behaviour

Communicating with people of different cultures, the individuals cannot usually foresee their behaviour, taking into account only their own cultural norms and rules. Meanwhile, the main point of communication lies in that the individual should understand any particular action of the partner. In cross-cultural communication, the meaning of an action is not always transparent: as a rule, it is hidden in traditional ideas of normal and abnormal behaviour, specific for any culture.

> The rules of behaviour in a Japanese house, for example, are too complicated to be learned quickly. For a start, one should not step on or over anything and should sit where told. There are prescribed poses for sitting on a tatami. The most ceremonious of all is kneeling and sitting on one's heels. This is a pose for bows. To bow when sitting on a cushion is not polite: one should move first to the floor. To sit with the legs crossed is a relaxed pose. Stretching the legs toward a partner is considered the utmost impoliteness.

Human behaviour in communication is determined by a number of factors that have different degrees of importance and influence. The studies suggest that in modern circumstances, human behaviour is determined by the following reasons.

Firstly, these are *peculiarities of enculturation* that occur on the conscious level through socialization by means of education and up-bringing as well as on the unconscious level – when the individual learns the culture in everyday situations, in an uncontrolled way. The research shows that the part of culture, learned unconsciously, is not less important than that learned consciously.

Thus, we may compare culture with an iceberg whose smaller part is above water, whereas the bigger part is underwater. The visible part is formal culture. This is the level of necessary patterns of behaviour, and here cross-cultural failures are rare. Consequently, people rarely get hurt or offended.

The invisible part of culture is its informal level, where all actions are performed automatically and almost unconsciously. In other words, most behaviour patterns within a culture are used automatically, as well as automatically do people perceive phenomena of other culture, without giving a thought to mechanisms of perception. Realization of this fact occurs only in extraordinary situations of cross-cultural communication. Behaviour patterns on this level are not explicit, they are determined unconsciously and controlled by the feeling indicating that something is wrong. That is why assessment of behaviour is accompanied by emotions, since violation of unwritten rules seriously affects relationships.

Unconscious perception of a culture is important for communication, since if communicators' behaviour is based exclusively on it, they seem to be unable to consciously determine perception of a different culture which brings a conversations to a dead-end. To solve this dilemma is possible either with the help of a neutral party or with purposeful study of cross-cultural competence that helps to find a common point of view in overt discussion of the both parties' unconscious convictions.

Secondly, the situation, called by Edward Hall "*cultural glasses*", is no less important for people's communicative behaviour. It lies in that most people treat their culture as standard to compare with. In everyday life, the individual does not usually realize that patterns of

his/her behaviour and ways of perception are determined by his/her own culture and that people of other cultures have different points of view and value systems.

The famous German researcher of everyday culture H.Bausinger notes that everyday behaviour of most people is characterized by naïve realism [Bausinger 1999]. They consider that the world is what they think of it. For them, the world consists of an infinite number of things, people, events that they perceive as natural and normal. Usually people do not suspect that their worldview is relative. Lack of critical approach makes people believe that their culture is superior. That is why everything that does not agree with their norms, habits, types of behaviour is considered second-class, ugly and amoral. This conviction of their cultural superiority encourages them to behave superciliously and to despise other cultures.

Thirdly, behaviour is also determined by *circumstances.* People act differently in different situations. The place may dictate certain rules (e.g. restaurant, classroom, church, office, etc.). Consciously or unconsciously, people stick to rules, prescribed by their culture. In particular, behaviour patterns in churches differ significantly across cultures, so a church may be a perfect example of a place with thoroughly regulated behaviour patterns.

> Considerable differences are observed also in meals, amount of food, table manners, attention to guests, etc. Russians have their guest seated at the table. It surprises Americans whose dinner is usually preceded by a glass of wine with hors d'oeuvres. When at table, Russians put food on everyone's plate, while in the USA dishes are passed round so that everyone can put as much treat as they like. A Russian hostess tries to fill her guests up, which is not accepted in American culture. As a result, Americans have difficulty in finding the right strategy at the Russian table. Russian guests of Americans, on the contrary, often leave half hungry: they expect their hosts to insist on their having a bite after they refused once, since in Russian tradition hosts should be persistent in attempts to feed their guests. Americans do not offer the dish for the second time and Russians are too shy to ask to pass them the dish.

One cannot but mention that guests are granted with a different status across cultures. In the majority of Eastern cultures, guests are the central figures in the house, their wishes are complied with at once, their words are listened to. In Western cultures, guests are "only guests", they are welcome but pleasing them is not a host's priority.

The notion of circulstances also covers temporal aspects of an interaction. If people are short of time, they, as a rule, try to complete a conversation and terminate the contact in order to have time for something important and necessary. Every contact takes place at a certain part of the day, which influences its character. In order to understand this factor, you should imagine your reaction to a 2 a.m. phone call and to a 2 p.m. call.

All in all, almost any CCC on the individual level is a clash of various worldviews when partners do not realize their differences and consider their behaviour "normal". Communicators' behaviour is characterized by the fact that something "natural" of one party collides with something "natural" of the other. At first, it is perceived as open lack of understanding, discrepancy of opinions and evaluation. More often than not, none of the parties question their own "natural" but automatically choose the ethnocentric position and the partner is ascribed foolishness, ignorance or ill will.

And yet, everyone may recall many examples from their own experience when talking to people was comfortable and easy. This is communication with loved ones, with close friends: everything happens "by itself", without psychological tension or deep considerations. These situations are characterized by natural desire to understand the communicator, not to hurt him/her, etc. This type of communication is called **empathy**.

The term "empathy" has been becoming popular in the majority of humanities for quite a while. Empathy is defined as capacity to recognize and, to some extent, share feelings (such as sadness or happiness) that are being experienced by others. (The English word was coined in 1903 by E.B.Titchener as an attempt to translate the German word "Einfühlungsvermögen", a new phenomenon explored at the end of the 19th century mainly by Theodor Lipps. It was later re-translated into the German language as "Empathie" and is still in use there.).

Empathy in communication is expressed in willingness not so much to understand the hidden meaning of the partner's words but to feel the partner's state. It is very important, since the partner may have difficulty in finding the right words, tone, style, etc. Sometimes, due to conventions of a certain culture, people start expressing their thoughts with an elaborate introduction that reveals their intention. They, so to say, "encode" their ideas and feelings in conventional words, that is why they do not succeed in expressing their thoughts in the right way for their partner to understand them.

Besides, differences between feelings and communicative content are not always easy to grasp. But if the difference is understood by the partner, the speaker makes greater effort. Experiencing the partner's feelings, people show how much they understand their partner. In these cases, efficiency of communication depends not only on factual information but on states and feelings.

Empathetic qualities of the individual are more varied and developed if the individual has extensive experience in cross-cultural communication. Besides, empathy is necessarily determined by understanding of one's self. Trying to cognize one's self, one's motives and needs, one turns to analogy, uses the psychological mechanism of identification, typical of people, constantly watching their own actions and states. This forms one's SELF, which is the starting point for the individual's judgment of other people's inner states and feelings. This process is called **attribution** of one's own feelings to the partner. It is particularly obvious in cross-cultural interactions (for more details see p. 243–248).

In intercultural communication, empathy lies in that the subject of communication tries to reproduce in him/herself other people's feelings. In other words, empathy is revealed in the ability to walk in other people's shoes, to feel the partners' state and to take it into account in communication. Empathy means transferring elements of other individual's inner world onto one's own. Empathy insures not only understanding of the partner's states and behaviour but also certain acceptance of his/her motives, emotions, explaining and justifying his/her behaviour.

Every type of communication is characterized by specific relations between partners, their goals and tasks. Specific features of

CCC lie in that the partners attempt to understand each other's thoughts, reasons, and viewpoints. To succeed, one needs to consider the partner's behaviour in the framework of their culture rather than one's own, i.e. here it is only empathetic attitude that is relevant. This attitude means intellectual, mental and emotional immersion into the partner's inner world, feelings, thoughts and expectations.

Psychological empathy is based on the presupposition that in similar circumstances all people go through approximately the same emotions and this experience helps them to understand the other point of view, ideas and cultural phenomena. Owing to this peculiarity, the individual may imagine him/herself in the other person's place, accept his/her outlook, understand his/her emotions, desires and actions. In this connection, it is timely to recall the alternative to the "golden rule of moral" – the "*platinum rule of communication*". The rule may be expressed in a compact form as essence of the empathetic approach: "*do onto others as you wish them to do onto you*".

Empathy, with its ambition to understand cultural differences from inside and to find necessary ways to mutual understanding, greatly enhances the possibility of harmonious relations between partners. To achieve this, one has to do the following:

- to listen attentively what the partner says;
- to strive to understand how the partner feels;
- to be sincerely interested in other people's words and actions;
- to show compassion for others' needs and interests;
- to be able to understand the partner's viewpoint.

Psychology has worked out a number of special methods that help to enhance susceptibility to other people's feelings. One of them is the method of tuning. It presupposes that one should try maximum tuning to the partner with the help of imitation of the partner's behaviour: to strike the same pose, to copy the tempo of his/her speech, etc. Research shows that this helps to understand the partner's feelings and state better.

4. Culture and Values

Getting to know the world, everyone decides for themselves which elements of the world are important for their lives and which are meaningless, what is essential and what can be done without. As a result, everyone forms their axiological attitude to the world, according to which all objects and phenomena are considered along the scale of importance. Everything, every phenomenon or idea get assessed and represent a certain value. The human world offers various types of values. We may distinguish between *material values*; values as *ideals*; values as a specific type of *norms, traditions, customs, impositions, bans*. According to spheres of social life, we may distinguish between *material* and *spiritual values*, *utilitarian values, sociopolitical, cognitive, moral, aesthetic, religious values*, etc. The essence of values lies in their importance rather than in the very fact of their existence. One should bear in mind that values differ from the object in which they are found, since not all objects and processes are values. Thus, *values are commonly held standards of what is acceptable or unacceptable, important or unimportant, right or wrong, workable or unworkable in a community or society.* They are ideal models of real objects and relations, set in a culture and expressed in people's activity and communication.

Every value is experienced by the individual as referring to him/her personally, but the value is created collectively. This double nature of a value explains its role as factor of a culture: a value symbolizes membership of a person in a cultural community.

Axiology has recently become the subject of scientific interest of Western philosophers and sociologists. Their attention is focused mainly on such moral values as Truth, the Good, Beauty. These exist and reveal themselves as norms in all spheres of thought and feeling.

All in all, values make up the foundation of a culture and are present in all its realizations. A value is a spiritual goal. It expresses the live nerve of a culture, its meaningful core. Meanwhile, a value expresses cultural dynamics. When spiritual landmarks change, a new, essentially different epoch starts.

Values function as certain spiritual basis that helps humankind to sustain ordeals. Values give order to the world, imbue the world with evaluative colouring and give sense to human life, since they correspond to ideas of the ideal, the desired, the normative. The role of values in life of the individual as well as in society is extremely important. They function as strong regulators of human activity, since they control the choice of information in interaction with the environment, they control social relations, they form feelings and communicative skills.

In the process of historical development, any people forms its own system of evaluative attitude to nature, people of own and other communities, ideas and things. On the basis of these attitudes, a value system and a culture are formed. The evaluative attitude forms, in its turn, behavioural patterns and regulates behaviour of representatives of this people.

The games we play are metaphors of what we value in our culture

The playful nature of human beings is embodied in the label *homo ludens* ("the playing man"). Play takes on different meaning within one culture compared to another; in one place competition and winning is the main objective of play, while in another culture the role of play is to bring people together for amusement without the need to win. In short, games and play are metaphors of ourselves; they display a way of looking at our behavior and what we value in our culture. [Gore 2007, p. 116]

For example, how can a national culture like that of the United States be expressed in the form of a metaphor? One suggestion would be to compare the national culture of the US to the game of American football, thus the metaphor is American football. By understanding the game, one can understand something about the American cultural mindset. A prerequisite of a cultural metaphor is that all or most of the members of the culture consider it to be very important and they can identify with it.

> The outlandish speed, the constant movement, the high degree of specialization, the consistent aggressiveness, and the intense competition in football also apply to the national culture of the United States. Football is a team sport, yet the individual is glorified and celebrated. Professional football is thus a metaphor that describes critical aspects of American culture; the basic components of the football metaphor are individualism, competitive specialization, huddling (a close group that is united only for the accomplishment of a task and motivated by both personal and group concerns that disband when the task is complete) and the ceremonial celebration of perfection. [Ibid., p. 147]
>
> In this connexion, it is relevant to quote an observation, made by Lee Kun-Hee, the chairman of Samsung Electronics: "Golf is characterized by rules, etiquette and self-discipline. Baseball contrasts the value of the star player with the spirit of the catcher, silently leading without demanding the spotlight. Rugby teaches decisiveness and a spirit of struggle."

Human consciousness contains values of various types and content. Therefore we may speak of a value system where certain values are ordered in relation to each other. The matter is that on the basis of his/her cultural norms and customs, the individual gradually forms a system of main values that guides him/her throughout his/her life. Every culture forms its own value system that is usually a hierarchy (i.e. values are ordered according to their importance). Owing to this system, a culture remains a whole, preserves its nature and predictability.

Values are subjective, since there hardly are phenomena, equally important for all people. That is why researchers distinguish between such types of values as personal values, age values, values of large or small social groups, historical values of different epochs and states, universal values, etc. Among these groups, we also find **cultural values** divided into **two main groups**:

Firstly, it is *outstanding intellectual, artistic and religious works*. This group also includes significant architectural constructions, unique pieces of craftsmanship, archeological and ethnographic rarities.

Secondly, cultural values consist of *principles of co-existence*: customs, stereotypes of consciousness and behaviour etc., that make a society integrated, that insure understanding between people, soli-

darity, mutual assistance, etc. Both of the groups make up the core of any culture and determine its uniqueness.

In CCC, one often comes across differences in perception of the same values. Among a great number of values, we may discern a group of those shared by all peoples both when their evaluation and content are concerned. These are *universal* values. Their universality stems from the biological nature of human beings and from social interaction of people regardless their cultural background. For example, there is no culture that would appreciate murder, lie and theft. Every culture has its limits of tolerance to these phenomena, but their negative evaluation is unambiguous.

Cultural anthropology suggests distinguishing the four main **spheres of cultural values** – *everyday routine, ideology, religion,* and *arts*. The sphere of everyday life is most important for cross-cultural communication.

The leading role of everyday culture in CCC is determined by the fact that it forms personality, since the processes of socialization and enculturation start in childhood, when the individual is not capable of learning cultural values of ideology, arts and religion. The importance of everyday culture stems from the fact that it elaborates and forms such values that perform the most essential role in CCC. It is the sphere of everyday life that stores historical memory, since it is much more stable than ideology and religion. That is why it is everyday culture that contains eternal values, both universal and ethnic. Actually, it is the values of everyday culture that form ideology, religion and arts.

Also, values of everyday culture are self-sufficient. It means that using values of everyday culture, the individual gets stable reference points in life within this culture. Values of everyday culture are born in practice and have utilitarian nature. That is why they do not need to be explained or proven, representatives of a culture take them for natural and understandable. To learn them means entering a culture.

Within a group of compatriots, values are taken for granted. Importance and power of a value are realized, as a rule, only in interaction with representatives of other cultures. It is these cases that are characterized by misunderstanding, confusion, helplessness, and irritation. To prevent these situations and to achieve positive results in

CCC is possible only with the help of knowledge of the partner's value orientation. This knowledge helps to predict the partner's behaviour, goals, and desires, secures success in communication.

The content of any situation includes norms and rules of interaction that prescribe certain behaviour. Every person, before establishing contacts with other people, usually compares the situation with actions, accepted in his/her environment, and expects other people to act accordingly. Thus, **norms** are an informal guideline about what is considered correct or incorrect social behaviour in a particular group or social unit. Norms form the basis of collective expectations that members of a community have from each other, and play a key part in social order by exerting pressure on the individual to conform.

The norm is one of the most essential peculiarities of a culture. Every people has its norms that cover all spheres of social life. They are formed historically, have set nature, their violation lead to certain sanetions. In practice, cultural norms are rules and behaviour patterns that limit natural freedom and require strict obedience in all cases.

The norms result from the fact that human life in a society is impossible without following certain rules. According to the rules, any culture has its idea of what is good or bad behaviour. That is why every culture forms a system of obligations and bans that prescribe a person certain actions in a certain situation, or indicate what a person should not do under any circumstances. Thus, cultural norms prescribe how young and elderly, bosses and subordinates, men and women, law-abiding citizens and criminals must communicate.

Norms are numerous and vary from culture to culture. According to their nature, goal and sphere of application, boundaries, severity of enforcement, behavioural norms are divided into *customs, morals, rituals,* and *laws.*

Morals were historically primary regulators of human behaviour. They help to evaluate different forms of people's relationship. Of all norms, morals are the most dynamic and mobile, since they aim to regulate current events and actions. They are moral evaluation of our and other people's actions.

Due to their nature, morals do not presuppose any immediate application and sanetions for their violation is inconsiderable. The responsibility is relative, and punishment may vary from disapproving

looks to death, but the most frequent form of punishment is oral condemnation or reproach.

Customs are the most wide-spread and influential cultural norms, they are historical forms of social regulation of behaviour and interpersonal relations. Customs mostly influence the sphere of private life and regulate relationships among close relatives, friends, public behaviour outside the house, everyday etiquette with acquaintances and strangers.

> Preservation of behaviour patterns is particularly characteristic of traditional societies. For example, in Malaysia, the norms of the "parents - children" behaviour pattern have been passed on for centuries as well as respect of rank and financial status. According to the norms of everyday behaviour, it is indecent to point one's index finger at somebody. One has to clench a fist and point at the person with the thumb. To take and to pass anything is allowed only with the right hand, even better — with both hands, slightly leaning forward.

The regulatory role of customs lies in that they prescribe a strictly set behaviour in a certain situation. Customs have appeared as factor providing social stability. The whole society is interested in maintaining them, that is why they have survived centuries.

Every culture forms its own system of customs, embracing all spheres of everyday life.

> Such an everyday activity as having meals is also part and parcel of "customs". If we take English-speaking communities as an example, we will discover besides a range of meal titles that exist throughout the English-speaking world, also some differences between regions of England itself as well as between classes of British English society. There are some meals (and, correspondingly, meal names) that are very specific to ex-colonial areas of the world. Thus, a working-class Northerner in England may eat *dinner* at midday and *tea* at five o'clock, whilst a middle-class Southerner may eat *lunch* and *supper* at roughly the same

times (probably 1 p.m. and 6 or 7 p.m.). There are still areas in India previously colonized by British where the afternoon *high tea* is called *tiffin* and the Americans have contributed the very useful blend of *lunch* and *breakfast* — *brunch,* which is a large mid-morning meal that obviates the need for two meals.

Differences are observed in typical ways of spending spare time. Thus, in Germany, these are car washing, lawn mowing, and walking. In Ukraine, people spend their weekends going to the country houses, visiting or meeting friends and relatives.

The nature and main features of customs necessarily correspond to lifestyle of a society and its social structure, while similar customs in different cultures may acquire different content and meaning. For example, in European countries, shopping presupposes that relations between a shop-assistant and a buyer are based on a fixed price. Bargaining is a necessary component of shopping in Arabic countries. There haggling is simultaneously a form of communication which is also exciting and emotional.

Another interesting phenomenon in the context of culture is the custom of "kissing a friend" upon meeting in public or private. In some countries the occasion demands an exchange of three kisses (France, the Netherlands) whereas in other countries two is the limit (Britain, Germany). The custom is restricted to behaviour between women and men towards women: for men to exchange kisses is highly unusual in Western Europe. In some Eastern European countries, on the contrary, it is common on some occasions for men to exchange kisses with men.

Arranging marriages may be one more example. Thus, in Europe and Northern America it is quite natural when young people themselves decide to marry. Meanwhile, peoples of Asia and Africa consider that the heads of families should first strike a deal concerning marriage. Customs may prohibit a fiancé to see his future wife before the wedding. A girl from Western society, cherishing the dream of romantic love, would be horrified by the thought of being sold to her future husband, without any right to participate in this decision. In other cultures, on the contrary,

selling a fiancée is the norm: relatives name the price, paid quite willingly by the groom's party.

All in all, customs exist in the most diverse spheres of human life. Taken together, they are a set system of human behaviour. This type of cultural norms excludes the element of motivation, since norms, making up a custom, should be implemented automatically. Representatives of a culture must follow the set pattern only on the basis of intuitive conviction that "*our ancestors did this in such a way*", "*it is conventional*", etc.

Ritual is a specific form of cultural norms. It is a set of symbolic stereotypical collective actions that stand for certain social ideas, values and norms. Its distinctive features are numerous participants and highly emotional state. As a rule, rituals accompany important moments of human life, connected with birth, wedding, entering the other social or age groups, death. Religious rituals are the most vivid examples. It is well-known that some religions have maintained sacrifices with food (in Christianity, for example, one receives communion with bread and wine). It is not surprising, since food is the basis of human existence. That is why almost all religions ascribe food symbolic and mystic meanings. At early stages of human development, eating meant not only quenching one's hunger but also getting closer to the world, since it was believed that the strength of an animal comes to a human eating the animal's flesh, just like grains and berries bring humans closer to the strength of the Earth.

Law is an inseparable part of any culture. It is a system of obligatory behaviour patterns, sanctioned by the state. In primitive societies, functions of law are performed by taboos. By its nature, law is a joint agreement between people on behaviour rules. These rules are obligatory for everyone and their realization is controlled by the state. Law covers all spheres of social and private life, since legal norms determine production and distribution of cultural activity among people, prescribe contacts and relations between people.

Thus, different types of cultural norms permeate almost all spheres of human activity. Their spectrum is very wide – from prohibitions to complex system of social institutes. Some of these norms have become a cultural values, their obligatory nature is perceived by a society not just as duty but as necessity, the individual's inner conviction. All these normative regulators may be both permitting and prohibiting. Regard-

less their nature, they help to coordinate actions of individuals and groups, to work out the best ways of settling conflict situations, to find cultural ways to satisfy various needs.

5. Cultural identity

Socialization and enculturation presuppose learning cultural value systems and norms of behaviour in a society, they help to identify one's place in the environment from the point of view of economic, religious, ethnic and social membership. Everyone tries to correspond to the value system, dominant in a certain society. This correspondence is achieved through identifying oneself with certain ideas, values, social group and culture. This type of self-identification is called "identity". Up to the 60s, this term was hardly used. Its popularity was brought about by the American psychologist Erik Eriksson. Since the middle of the 70s, this term has become well-established in the vocabulary of socio-humanitarian sciences.

"Identity" means the individual's awareness of belonging to a certain socio-cultural group, which allows the individual to identify the place in socio-cultural space and operate in the environment. The individual should voluntarily accept dominant elements of consciousness, tastes, habits, norms and values, conventional for other people. Learning these elements of social life provides the individual with orderly, predictable life as well as makes the individual part of a certain culture.

Since the individual is simultaneously a member of several social and cultural groups, we may distinguish between a number of identities: professional, social, ethnic, political, religious, psychological and cultural. We are naturally more interested in *cultural identity*, i.e. *the individual's membership in a certain culture or cultural group that forms the individual's evaluation of self, of other people, society and the world in general.* It should be noted that some sociologists and philosophers, under the banner of postmodernism claim that in the contemporary age identities are changing and are very different from those in the past. Identities have become increasingly freer, ambiguous and plural in the postmodern age. Many postmodernist writers suggest

that the "master identities" of class, age, gender and ethnicity are "decomposing". They are falling away, to be replaced by new identities based on a whole range of sources, including consumerism, the body and sexuality [Kidd 2002, p. 27].

> Some scholars point out that in the past it was more common to hear people connect a part of their identity with the place they worked for, for example, "I'm with IBM." Nowadays, the trend is to define oneself by the area one works in and the place, such as "I'm a software developer and I live in London." The researchers note that the shift in identity is from "Where do you work?" to "Where do you live?" In other words, place is becoming an important source of status. [Gore 2007, p. 128]

Cultural identity is people's conscious acceptance of corresponding behaviour patterns, value orientations and language, understanding SELF from positions of cultural characteristics, accepted in this society.

Cultural identity is important in CCC, since it presupposes formation in a person of certain stable qualities, due to which cultural phenomena or people make the person feel sympathy or dislike. They result in the person's choice of a relevant type, manner and form of communication.

In cultural anthropology, there is an axiom that everyone is a bearer of a certain culture They grew up in, though people do not notice this in their everyday lives, taking for granted peculiarities of their culture. Meeting representatives of other cultures, people see these peculiarities and start realizing that there are types of feelings, behaviour, thinking, considerably different from what they are used to. All these impressions are transformed in the individual's consciousness into ideas, beliefs, stereotypes, expectations that finally become important regulators of behaviour and communication. Through comparing and opposing viewpoints of various cultures and communities, CCC conditions formation of the individual's identity, i.e. a set of the individual's knowledge and ideas about his/her place and role as a member of a relevant sociocultural group, his/her abilities and qualities.

Since people combine several identities at a time (ethnic, gender, age, etc.), a certain type of identity may hinder communication. Depend-

ing on the partner's identity, the manner of speech, topics, gestures may seem relevant or, on the contrary, out of place. It is participants' cultural identity that determines the sphere and content of communication. Diversity of ethnic identities (being one of the most important factors in CCC) may be simultaneously an obstacle for communication.

> Observation and experiments of ethnologists show that during corporate dinners in multinational companies, participants' interpersonal relations are based on ethnic principles. Conscious attempts to mix up representatives of different ethnic groups have failed, since after a while they again form ethnically homogeneous groups (e.g. on such events, representatives of Scandinavian countries tend to communicate with each other more than with people from Slavonic states, who, in their turn, also prefer the company of their kin).

Thus, in CCC, cultural identity has a double function. It helps communicators to form an idea of each other, to predict each other's behaviour and views, i.e. it facilitates communication. Meanwhile, it also limits communication, since it breeds conflicts and confrontation. The limiting nature of cultural identity is directed at rationalization of communication, i.e. at restriction of communicative process within the boundaries of mutual understanding and avoiding those aspects that may lead to conflicts.

Though we tend to consider our identity as being rather uniform at any given point in time, its interesting facet is that it is located in place and time. In other words, it changes over time. The surrounding also appears to affect how we perceive our identity. Consider, for example, an abstract from an essay, written by a Russian student in Finland:

> ...I'm not a typical Russian, but I'm not a typical Finn either. However, I tend to think of myself as being more Russian than Finnish, but that also depends *where I am located at that time.* In Finland, I see myself as more Russian, but in Russia it's the opposite. [Gore 2007, p.44]

Cultural identity is based on discrimination between "our" and "other". This discrimination may lead both to cooperation and to confrontation. The matter is that from the very first contacts with representatives of different cultures, the individual comes to realize that they react differently to certain phenomena, they have their own value systems and behaviour norms, significantly different from those, imposed by the individual's native culture. Discrepancy of certain phenomena in other and in the native cultures gives rise to the feeling of the "other".

The range of feelings, accompanying this discovery, is quite wide – from mere astonishment to active indignation and protest. Either of the partners realizes culturally specific views of the other and as a result, "something natural" clashes against "something natural". Realization and awareness of cultural differences becomes a starting point for understanding of causes of inadequate communication.

In CCC, the notion "other" becomes the key one. The problem is that up to the present moment, this notion has not been defined. In all its variants, it is understood on everyday level, i.e. by distinguishing and enumerating the most characteristic qualities and features of the term. Here are several meanings, associated with the term "other":

- "other" as foreign, outside the limits of native culture;
- "other" as strange, unusual, contrasting the usual and customary environment;
- "other" as unfamiliar, unknown, beyond understanding;
- "other" as supernatural, almighty;
- "other" as ominous, threatening.

As a result, "other" means something strange to usual, known phenomena and ideas. And vice versa, the opposite notion "our" implies phenomena of the world seen as familiar, customary.

When contacting with other peoples, the individual's perception is determined by culturally specific differences between native and other cultures. Facing the other culture, a person always gets an ambiguous feeling: on the one hand, the "other" makes the person feel strange, unusual, anxious, suspicious; on the other hand, the person feels surprise, sympathy, interest in new forms and phenomena.

Reading and assignments

1. *a) One of the most obvious areas of cultural influence is everyday objects: houses, furniture, kitchen utensils etc. Bring an object (or its picture) that is specific to a certain culture, that is which is only found in the culture. In Netherlands, for example, there is a product, called* flessenlikker *(bottle licker), largely unknown outside the country. It exemplifies well a characteristically Dutch trait: frugality, that is, getting to and using up every last bit of peanut butter or mayonnaise in a jar, which results in savings in the long run.*

b) From something as basic as bread, we can learn some information about culture-specific behaviour, values and even the influence of climate on diet. For example,
– bread typical in the United States is a common food, square-shaped, i.e. convenient for making sandwiches, pre-sliced to save time, since Americans particularly value convenience and time-saving, even in food;
– bread typical in France is baked daily and stays fresh only one day, made by hand, since French consumers place a high value on freshness and an artisan tradition in food;
– bread typical in Finland is made of rye, which grows well in Finland's cool summers, has a hole in the centre because in former times it was strung on beams in the kitchen for long storage. Finns value their own food traditions despite climate disadvantages and grow rye even if it is not cost-effective; agrarian traditions are kept alive even if the practical function exists no longer.
As we see, all this information is communicated non-verbally by a material object. At first glance, bread or other material objects in a culture do not readily "communicate" such information. The challenging task is to be able to perceive culture in objects. Think of any other object that is found in different modifications in several cultures and try to explain causes of the differences.
c) Think about business practices in Ukrainian culture and one that is unique (the practice can be something that is product- or ser-

vice-related). How did this practice evolve and why does it suit Ukrainian culture particularly well? Is it exportable?

One illustrative example comes from the USA, where the automobile reigns as the main means of getting around. As Americans are accustomed to doing a lot of things from the seat of their car, it was only a natural outcome that cash machines (ATMs) would also be designed so that people can drive up to them and withdraw cash. Walking zones are not common in American cities and placing an ATM there would mean that there would have to be parking as well, so by situating ATM's at a "cash station," customers can drive through to get cash quickly.

2. *In each culture, its representatives have different schemata for similar occasions. Unawareness of the way things are done in a culture may place a person in an awkward situation like it happened to a Dutch businessman who was invited to a Frenchman's home at 8 o'clock in the evening. The Dutchman and his wife had their dinner at 6 (usual time for the main hot meal of the day in the Netherlands) and arrived punctually at 8, to discover to their dismay that a full four-course dinner was waiting for them. They tried to do justice to the meal, but of course did not quite succeed.*

Get ready to present the Frenchman's or the Dutchman's point of view on the situation.

How would you have coped with the situation?

The case proves that every standard situation (e.g. visiting business partners) requires from people certain behaviour pattern. Think of visiting rituals typical of two different cultures. What is expected to be done? Here are several points you make need to take account of:

– whether you are expected to be punctual;

– whether you are expected to bring a present, and if so, what sort of present it should be;

– what sort of clothes to wear;

– whether to expect refreshments, or a meal, if asked for a certain time;

– whether, and how you are expected to comment on food, furnishings, etc.;

– how long you are expected to stay as well as when and how to take leave.

3. Read the texts on various parenting styles, as described by Erik Erikson, the prominent author and child psychotherapist, as he visited the Sioux Indians and the Yurok Indians correspondingly. Answer the questions below.

The colostrum (the first watery secretion from the milk glands) was generally considered to be poison for the baby; thus the breast was not offered to him until there seemed to be a good stream of perfect milk. The Indian women maintained that it was not right to let a baby do all the initial work only to be rewarded with a thin, watery substance. The implication is clear: how could he trust a world which greeted him thus? Instead, as a welcome for the whole community, the baby's first meal was prepared by relatives and friends. They gathered the best berries and herbs the prairie affords and put their juice into a buffalo bladder, which was fashioned to serve as a "breastlike nursing bottle".

The Yurok's attempt at accelerating autonomy in their young begins in utero. The pregnant woman eats little, carries much wood, and preferably does work which forces her to bend forward, so that the fetus will not rest against her spine – i.e., relax and recline. Later, not only does early weaning further require him to release his mother; the baby's legs are left uncovered in the Yurok version of the cradleboard, and from the twentieth day on they are massaged by the grandmother to encourage early creeping.

- *What parenting styles do these two quotations describe?*
- *Think of Ukrainian way to rear children. Has it changed throughout centuries?*

Read the abstract where Russian parenting style is compared with English one and answer the question below.

Вся русская культура, как и итальянская, семейно-психологическая. Как и воспитание актеров, так и воспитание детей складывается здесь прямо противоположным образом. Нашего русского инфантилизма здесь нет, в восемнадцать лет человек уходит из дома, чтобы научиться на себя зарабатывать. Здесь четырнадцатилетний подросток вам подробно объяснит, почему он делает это, а не это. Он уже отвечает за собственные

действия и собственное мировоззрение. Но зато и со стариками здесь никто не носится, здесь нет столь сентиментального отношения к родителям. Все это связано со старой колониальной психологией, когда ребенка с детства готовили к карьере в колонии. [АММЗЖ 1999, с. 150]

> • *Would it be correct to claim that Ukrainian and Russian parenting styles are identical? Give arguments. Can you give reasons why they are what they are?*

4. *Read abstracts from the article by Robert Lado "How to compare two cultures" where he discusses the problem of meanings, ascribed by cultures to behaviour forms. Answer the questions below. (Dr.Robert Lado (1915-1995) was born in Tampa, Florida, to Spanish immigrants. His parents soon returned to their native Spain, and it was not until he came back to the United States as an adult that he learned English. This experience would inspire Dr.Lado's life-long interest in the practical aspects of foreign language teaching. Dr.Lado was one of the founders of TESOL. He wrote innumerable articles and nearly 60 books on linguistics and the training of qualified teachers of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL).)*

Meanings…are culturally determined or modified. They represent an analysis of the universe as grasped in a culture. Patterned forms have a complex of meanings, some representing features of process or quality, some grasped as primary, others as secondary, tertiary, etc. Eating breakfast, lunch, and dinner are engaged in usually to provide food and drink for the body… breakfast, lunch, and dinner have that primary meaning. In addition, a particular form of breakfast at a particular time of day may have a meaning of good or bad on a moral or religious scale, on a health scale, on an economic scale, etc. A particular form of breakfast may carry as secondary meaning a social-class identification, a national origin identification, a religious identification. In short, any of the distinctions and groupings of a culture may be part of the meaning of a particular form unit.

All these meaningful units of form are distributed in patterned ways. Their distribution patterns are complexes involving various time cycles, space locations, and positions in relation to other units.

Breakfast, for example, shows time distribution on a daily cycle, a weekly cycle, and a yearly cycle.

Form, meaning, and distribution probably do not exist independent of each other in a culture, but they are spoken of operationally here as separate. Forms are relevant when they have meaning; meaning presupposes a form in order to be of relevance to us; and meaningful forms always occur in patterned distribution.

Within a culture we can assume that when an individual observes a significant patterned form in a patterned distribution spot, it will have a complex of culturally patterned meanings for him. [*Compare, for example, the meaning of breakfast in the kitchen at 7a.m. that consists of coffee, fruit juice and cereal and is served by the "eater" and breakfast in bed at 11 a.m. that contains caviar and is served by a waiter. – I.A.*]

A very interesting kind of trouble spot is seen when any element of the form of a complex pattern has different classification or meaning in across cultures. The foreign observer gives to the entire pattern the meaning of that different classification of one element. We may take bullfighting as an example. For an American, the meaning of bullfighting is the slaughter of a "defenseless" animal by an armed man. It is unfair because the bull always gets killed. It is unsportsmanlike – to the bull. It is cruel to animals. The fighter is therefore cruel. The public is cruel.

[*Difference in English and Spanish classification of the form can be traced already on the vocabulary level. – I.A.*] A number of vocabulary items that are applicable both to animals and to humans in English have separate words for animals and for humans in Spanish.

In Hispanic culture the distinction between man and animal seems very great, certainly greater than that in American culture.

In Spanish culture, a man is not physically strong but is skilful and intelligent. A bull is strong but not skilful and intelligent. In American culture a man is physically strong, and so is a bull. A bull is intelligent. A bull has feelings of pain, sorrow, pity, tenderness – at least in animal stories… A bull deserves an even chance in a fight; it has that sportsman's right even against a man.

…the part of the complex form represented by the bull has a different classification, a different meaning, in American culture, and herein lies the source of the misinformation.

A form in culture B, identified by an observer from culture A as the same form as one in his own culture, actually has a different meaning. [*Example: milk in the USA is a standard drink. In France wine is a standard drink. Wine in the USA is a sign of some special occasion – I.A.*]

We can expect another kind of trouble spot when the same meaning in two cultures is associated with different forms. The alien observer seeking to act in the culture being learned will select his own form to achieve the meaning, and he may miss altogether the fact that a different form is required.

There is trouble in learning a foreign culture when a pattern that has the same form and the same meaning shows different distribution. [*Example: For some time it was puzzling to me that on the one hand Latin American students complained that North American meals abused the use of sugar, while on the other hand the dieticians complained that Latin Americans used too much sugar at meanings. We can observe that the average Latin American student takes more sugar in his coffee than do North Americans. He is not used to drinking milk at meals, but when milk is served, he sometimes likes to put sugar in it. The dietician notices this use of sugar in situations in which North Americans would use less or none at all. The dietician notices also that the sugar bowls at tables where Latin Americans sit have to be filled more often than at other tables.*

The Latin American student for his part finds a salad made of sweet gelatine, or half a canned pear on a lettuce leaf. Sweet salad! He may see beans for lunch – a treat! He sits at the table, all smiles (…), he takes a good spoonful and, sweet beans! They are Boston baked beans. Turkey is served on Thanksgiving Day, but when the Latin American tastes the sauce, he finds that it is sweet – it is cranberry sauce. Sweet sauce for a broiled turkey! That is the limit – these North Americans obviously use too much sugar in their food. – I.A.] [Lado 1990, p.119-120; Lado 1998]

- *Think of other examples, perhaps from your own experience, when the same form is ascribed different meanings by representatives of two cultures.*
- *Give examples of cases when the same meaning is expressed by different forms in two cultures.*

5. *Read an abstract on the Good and the Evil in European and African cultures. Think of values, important for the British. Are they the same as values, cherished by, for example, Americans? Think of values, maintained in Ukrainian culture.*

На противагу християнському протиставленню Гріха та Чесноти, в африканській традиційній етиці Зло не є самостійною силою, яка протиставляється Добру, "енергія життя" несе в собі обидва начала, які можуть бути використані на благо людини або проти неї залежно від обставин і намірів. В африканських релігійних практиках екзальтованість, тілесна пластика, сексуальність, – всі ті якості, які в євро-християнській культурі прийнято вважати фемінними, – цінуються набагато вище, ніж у європейців, оскільки відбивають специфіку особи. На противагу традиційному християнському культові, в якому реципієнти ("паства") зображені в образі "читачів" або "слухачів" і ніби усунені від процесу творення Божественного слова, африканська обрядовість носить ініціативний, провокативний характер і прагне того, щоб стерти віддаленість між "автором" і "адресатом" в єдиній фігурі "учасника" дійства. Ключовим елементом африканських ритуалів є одержимість – трансовий стан, у процесі якого межі Суб'єкта і Божественного Іншого зливаються на плотському й емоційному рівнях, що приводить до розширення свідомості та виявлення в собі й навколишньому світі нових джерел духовності. Суперлогіка африканського універсуму полягає в тому, що Богові самому потрібна людина, оскільки він здатний еманувати себе тільки за допомогою людської плоті та чуттєвості. [Суковата 2004, с.396]

6. *Read the abstract on values maintained by American Indians. Think of values, fundamental for the Ukrainians.*

Respect for age. Children are expected to care for their elders, and this includes extended family members such as aunts and uncles. The leadership position in the family is held by an elder, most likely the eldest female member. The elderly are consulted for their wisdom and life experience.

Present-minded. Each day is lived to its fullest. The individual has little control over the future. Planning for the future is futile.

Value of extended family and clan system. The function of the family is for creation and caring. There is nothing more important than the family or clan. To be poor by American Indian standards is to be without family. In some American Indian tribes all women who were instrumental in the development of an individual are referred to as "mother". In other tribes, first cousins are treated as brothers and sisters.

Decision making. Problem solving and decision making is a group rather than individual experience. Decisions are based on what is best for the community not necessarily the individual.

Cooperation. Competition is devalued and discouraged as it weakens the cohesiveness of the group. Sharing is a core value of American Indians.

Time. The completion of a task takes precedent over appointments or meetings. Time is a continuum with no beginning nor end. It is not unusual for an American Indian home to be without clocks.

Status of role. Relationships are based on personal integrity not role, status, or accumulation of material goods. To the American Indian the concept of being is more important than the concept of achieving.

Natural resources and the environment. All of nature exists in harmony. Everything has a spirit. The American Indian uses only those resources needed to survive and does not change the environment to fit the needs of man, but lives and accepts the environment.

Health. The basis of health and well-being is to live in harmony and balance within the world. Health is not the absence of illness or disease. [Joho, Ormsby 2000, p.212]

7. *Read the abstract from Edward T.Hall's book* Beyond Culture *and identify values that characterize the two described cultures. Think of Ukrainian behaviour patterns that may seem strange or even insulting for foreigners and values on which these behaviours are grounded.*

…an overt act seen from the vantage point of one's own culture can have an entirely different meaning when looked at in the context of the foreign culture. I had been staying at a hotel in downtown Tokyo that had European as well as Japanese-type rooms. The clientele included a few Europeans but was predominantly Japanese. I had been a guest for about ten days and was returning to my room in the

middle of an afternoon. Asking for my key at the desk, I took the elevator to my floor. Entering the room, I immediately sensed that something was wrong. Out of place. Different. I was in the wrong room! Someone else's things were distributed around the head of the bed and the table. Somebody else's toilet articles (those of a Japanese male) were in the bathroom. My first thoughts were, "What if I am discovered here? How do I explain my presence to a Japanese who may not even speak English?"

I was close to panic as I realized how incredibly territorial we in the West are. (…) Baffled and mystified, I took the elevator to the lobby. Why hadn't they told me at the desk, instead of letting me risk embarrassment and loss of face by being caught in some-body else's room? (…)

At the desk I was told by the clerk, as he sucked in his breath in deference (and embarrassment?) that indeed they had moved me. My particular room had been reserved in advance by somebody else. I was given the key to my new room and discovered that all my personal effects were distributed around the new room almost as though I had done it myself. This produced a fleeting and strange feeling that maybe I wasn't myself. How could somebody else do all those hundred and one little things just the way I did?

Three days later, I was moved again, but this time I was prepared. There was no shock, just the simple realization that I had been moved and that it would now be doubly difficult for my friends who had my old room number to reach me. (…)

(…) we visited Kyoto, site of many famous temples and palaces, and the ancient capital of Japan.

(…) Kyoto is much more traditional and less industrialized than Tokyo. After we had been there about a week and had thoroughly settled into our new Japanese surroundings, we returned one night to be met at the door by an apologetic manager who was stammering something. I knew immediately that we had been moved, so I said, "You had to move us. Please don't let this bother you, because we understand. Just show us to our new rooms and it will be all right." Our interpreter explained as we started to go through the door that we weren't in that hotel any longer but had been moved to *another* hotel. What a blow! (…)

…the whole matter of being moved like a piece of derelict luggage puzzled me. In the United States, the person who gets moved is often the lowest-ranking individual. This principle applies to all organizations, including the Army. Whether you can be moved or not is a function of your status, your performance, and your value to the organization. To move someone without telling him is almost worse than an insult, because it means he is below the point at which feelings matter. In these circumstances, moves can be unsettling and damaging to the ego. (…)

I knew that my emotions on being moved out of my room in Tokyo were of the gut type and quite strong. There was nothing intellectual about my initial response. (…)

The answer finally came after further experiences in Japan and many discussions with Japanese friends. In Japan, one has to "belong" or he has no identity. When a man joins a company, he does just that – joins himself to the corporate body – and there is even a ceremony marking the occasion. Normally, he is hired for life, and the company plays a much more paternalistic role than in the United States.

(…) The answer to my puzzle was revealed when a Japanese friend explained what it means to be a guest in a hotel. As soon as you register at the desk, you are no longer an outsider; instead, for the duration of your stay you are a member of a large, mobile family. *You belong*. The fact that I was moved was tangible evidence that I was being treated as a family member – a relationship in which one can afford to be "relaxed and informal and not stand on ceremony." This is a very highly prized state in Japan, which offsets the official properness that is so common in public. Instead of putting me down, they were treating me as a member of the family. Needless to say, the large, luxury hotels that cater for Americans… have discovered that Americans do tenaciously stand on ceremony and want to be treated as they are at home in the United States. Americans don't like to be moved around; it makes them anxious. Therefore, the Japanese in these establishments have learned not to treat them as family members. [Hall 1989, p.58–65]

8. *Read the abstracts below and analyse phenomena described.*

(1) What happens to young people in a society that has lost all trace of ritual? Because adolescence is a transitional period, it is an

inherently perilous journey. But culture and ritual are supposed to protect us through the transitions of life, holding us in safety during danger and answering confusing questions about identity and change, in order to keep us from getting separated from the community during our hardest personal journeys.

In more primitive societies, a boy might go through an entire year of initiation rites to usher him into manhood. He might endure ritual scarification or rigorous tests of endurance, or he might be sent away from the community for a period of meditation and solitude, after which he would return to the fold and be seen by all as a changed being. He will have moved safely from boyhood into manhood, and he will know exactly when that happened and what is now expected of him, because his role is so clearly codified. But how is a modern American boy supposed to know when he has reached manhood? When he gets his driver's license? When he smokes pot for the first time? When he experiences unprotected sex with a young girl who herself has no idea whether she's a woman not or not?

(…) Jason's discomfort in his own skin seemed to me typical of many young American men, who see their female peers soar into a new world and often have trouble catching up. When Jason looks out into American society, after all, what does he see? Aside from the environmental and consumer crisis that so offends his sensibilities, he is facing a world undergoing a total cultural and gender upheaval. Men are still largely in charge, mind you, but they are slipping fast. Modern American is a society where college-educated men have seen their incomes drop 30 percent over the last twenty-five years. A society where women complete high school and college at significantly higher rates than men, and have new doors of opportunity opened to them every day. A society where a third of all wives make more money than their husbands. A society where women are increasingly in control of their biological and economic destinies, often choosing to raise their children alone or not to have children at all or to leave an identifiable man out of the reproduction picture entirely, through the miracles of the sperm bank. A society, in other words, where a man is not necessary in the way he was customarily needed – to protect, to provide, to procreate. [GETLAM, p. 203–204]

(2) Tulsi is so many interesting and foreign things to me at once – a teenager, a tomboy, an Indian girl, a rebel in her family, a soul who is crazy about God that it's almost like she's got a schoolgirl crush on Him. She also speaks a delightful, lilting English – the kind of English you can find only in India – which includes such colonial words as 'splendid!' and 'nonsense!' and sometimes produces eloquent sentences like: "It is beneficial to walk on the grass in the morning when the dew has already been accumulated, for it lowers naturally and pleasantly the body's temperature". When I told her once that I was going to Mumbai for the day, Tulsi said, "Please stand carefully, as you will find there are many speeding buses everywhere".

Tulsi and I have been talking a lot about marriage lately during our walks. Soon she will turn eighteen, and this is the age when she will be regarded as a legitimate marriage prospect. It will happen like this – after her eighteenth birthday, she will be required to attend family weddings dressed in a sari, signaling her womanhood. Some nice amma (auntie) will come and sit beside her, start asking questions and getting to know her: "How old are you? What's your family background? What does your father do? What universities are you applying to? What are your interests? When is your birthday?" Next thing you know, Tulsi's dad will get a big envelope in the mail with a photo of this woman's grandson who is studying computer sciences in Delhi, along with the boy's astrology charts and his university grades and the inevitable question, "Would your daughter care to marry him?"

Tulsi says, "It sucks."

But it means so much to the family, to see their children wedded off successfully. Tulsi has an aunt who just shaved her head as a gesture of thanks to God because her oldest daughter – at the Jurassic age of twenty-eight – finally got married. And this was a difficult girl to marry off, too; she had a lot of strikes against her. I asked Tulsi what makes an Indian girl difficult to marry off, and she said there are any number of reasons.

'If she has a bad horoscope. If she's too old. If her skin is too dark. If she's too educated and you can't find a man with a higher positions than hers, and this is a widespread problem these days because a woman cannot be more educated than her husband. Or she's had an affair with

someone and the whole community knows about it, oh, it would be quite difficult to find a husband after that…' [GEEPL, p.238–240]

(3)…I ended up participating in the blessing of a baby who had reached the age of six months, and who was now ready to touch the earth for the first time. The Balinese don't let their children touch the ground for the first six months of life, because newborn babies are considered to be gods sent straight from heaven, and you wouldn't let a god crawl around on the floor with all the toenail clippings and cigarette butts. So Balinese babies are carried for those six first months, revered as minor deities. If a baby dies before it is six months old, it is given a special cremation ceremony and the ashes are not placed in a human cemetery because this being was never human: it was only ever a god. But if the baby lives to six months, then a big ceremony is held and the child's feet are allowed to touch the earth at last and Junior is welcomed to the human race. [GEEPL, p. 420]

(4) The mood of the courtyard of Ketut's home is always one of total patience, though. Sometimes people must wait for three hours before Ketut gets a chance to take care of them, but they never so much as tap their feet or roll their eyes in exasperation. Extraordinary, too, is the way children wait, leaning up against their beautiful mothers, playing with their own fingers to pass the time. I'm always amused later when it turns out that these same tranquil children have been brought over to see Ketut because the mother and father have decided that the child is "too naughty" and needs a cure. *That* little child? That little three-year-old girl who was sitting silently in the hot sun for four hours, without complaint or snack or toy? She's *naughty*? I wish I could say, "People – you want to see naughty, I'll take you to America, show you some kids that'll have you believe in Ritalin." But there's just a different standard here for good behavior in children. [GEEPL, p. 321–322]

CHAPTER III
Culture and Language

It is all very well to regard language as simply "a means of communication." It may be that for poor handlers of a language and for those to whom it is new and unfamiliar, who use it only for the most basic exchanges. But for most of us it is also a machine for thinking, for feeling; and what can be thought and felt in one language – the sensibility it embodies, the range of phenomena it can take in, the activities of mind as well as the objects and sensations it can deal with – is different, both in quality and kind, from one language to the next. The world of Chinese and Arabic is different from the world of German or French or English, as the worlds those European languages embody and refer to differ from one another. (Malouf 2003, 44 from [Wierzbicka 2006, p. 299])

Every culture has its own language system that enables its speakers to communicate with each other. The most well-known verbal means of communication is, first of all, speech, since it is with the help of speech that people exchange information. Yet, human speech is only one element of language, that is why its functional possibilities are fewer than those of a language system in general.

Now, let us outline the possible dimensions of differences between languages. We will proceed from the phonetic level up. The following points will show how much we are all tied up with and to our native tongues.

Phonetic level. First of all, it should be stressed that the adult speaker of one language cannot easily pronounce language sounds of another, even though he/she has no speech impediment, and what is even more startling, he/she cannot easily hear language sounds other

than those of his/her native language, even though he/she suffers no hearing defect.

There is ample evidence that when learning a foreign language we tend to transfer our entire native language system in the process. We tend to transfer to that language our phonemes and their variants, our stress and rhythm patterns and their interaction with other phonemes. Thus we can understand the widely observed fact that the pronunciation of a German speaker learning English is quite noticeably different from that of a Spanish speaker learning English. As it happens, the speaker of one language listening to another does not actually hear the foreign language sound units – phonemes. He/she hears his own. Phonemic differences in the foreign language will be constantly missed by him/her if there is no similar phonemic difference in his/her native language. The Thai language makes a phonemic distinction between aspirated and unaspirated [p]. In English that difference is not phonemic, and as a result English speakers learning Thai usually do not hear the difference between the two [p] sounds in Thai.

Intonation is also a well-known problem area. As an example one may take a case when Indian women, newly hired to work in a British airport cafeteria, were having problems with their supervisors and their customers, both of whom felt that the Indian women were surly and uncooperative. The Indian women, for their part, were perplexed by the reactions "that they were getting and consequently felt discriminated against". From the tape recordings of the interactions, researchers observed that when customers who had ordered meat were asked whether they wanted gravy, the Indian workers would say *gravy* with a falling intonation. This would be heard by British speakers as "This is gravy. Take it or leave it". It was only after their attention was called to the way British employees made the same offer by using a rising intonation (*gravy?*) that they could see the source of the problem.

Lexical level. Vocabulary of a language is tightly bound with the concepts distinguished by speakers. The most frequent case of the discrepancy is absence of equivalents to express a concept. This occurs due to the unique nature of concepts or things, denoted by these words: some culture may contain them while others do not have them at all. Usually, these are specific names of clothes or food (*ale, whiskey,* vs *борщ, вареники, голубці*). In this connection, one may

also mention the words "glasnost" and "perestroika" that were borrowed by English speakers from Russian. These social phenomena are strange to the English-speaking community, so this lacuna was filled with the help of borrowings rather than coining a new word. (However, one should be careful with borrowings, since borrowed words may change their meaning in a recipient language, just like it happened to the word *partner* in Thai that came to mean *girl-gigolo*. We can also compare the different meanings in American and British English of the word *professor*.)

In CCC, the most complicated are situations when the same notion is differently – excessively or insufficiently – expressed in different languages. For example, we come across extremely elaborated nomination of certain phenomena in some languages (e.g. numerous words for snow in Eskimo, rain and rice – in languages of South East Asia), whereas other languages get by with one or two words to cover all the types of these phenomena.

In addition, the meaning of a word may not be reduced to denotation, it also depends on its collocability and connotation. Absolute correspondence is practically impossible. Learning a foreign language, one should pay attention to set expressions, where these words appear (*strong tea – міцний чай, heavy rain - сильний дощ, to gain experience – отримати досвід*). These are several examples of lexical collocability.

If we take the verb *go*, we may consider the Ukrainian *іти* an equivalent. The main meaning "move or pass from place to place" is common to both languages, as well as the meaning "extend" (e.g. *This road goes to London – Ця дорога іде до Лондона*); and so is the meaning "work" (*Is your watch going? Ваш годинник іде?*). There is, however, quite a considerable number of meanings that do not coincide. This is partly because of the English words *come* and *walk* that point out the direction and character of the movement. Compare: *Ось він іде! – Here he comes!* On the other hand, the Ukrainian language makes a distinction between *іти – їхати*. So that the English *go by train, go by bus* cannot be translated as **іти на поїзді/іти на автобусі*.

It is common knowledge that there are many cases when one English word combines the meanings of two or more Ukrainian words expressing similar notions and vice versa. For example:

> *coat – пальто, піджак, desk – парта, письмовий стіл,*
> *floor – підлога, поверх, to cry – кричати, плакати.*
> *нога – foot, leg; рука – arm, hand; пальці – fingers,*
> *toes; сон – sleep, dream; високий – high, tall.*

Some similar examples may be drawn from Spanish and English. Here, whilst *mañana* and *morning* are almost equivalent, the word *tarde* covers most of what English mean by *afternoon* as well as a good part of the *evening*. The later evening, when Spaniards tend to be still out and about, is covered by *noche*, although it also means *night* in the English sense of the time when English are in bed.

Moreover, even two seemingly "equivalent" words from two languages may stand for different concepts. Divergencies are particularly obvious when two remote cultures are compared. Thus, in Central Asia, in Turkmenistan, for instance, *table* may be a piece of cloth spread on the floor. Only a visit of European guests may make hosts bring the object with legs and a board on them. However, even European cultures may convey differences in viewing what stands behind the "equivalent" words.

For example, the film actress Elena Safonova, who was telling in one of her interviews about her life abroad, said that she had difficulties to adapt in France not only due to the French language. "The problem is", said she, "that when I say the word *table* in any language, I see a round wood table with four legs with a tea set on it. But when the French say *table* they see a glass object with one leg and flowers" (Аргументы и факты, 1996, №6). One may add that whereas the English *table* denotes all tables, Polish encodes *dining table* as *stol*, *coffee table* as *stolik*.

Lexical differences are observed even between variants of English. Thus, British English encodes anything south of the diaphragm as *stomach*, whereas in American English a *stomachache* denotes something different from a *bellyache.*

Cultural encodings can also change over time in the same language. For example, German that used to encode a state of happiness as *glücklich,* now encodes deep happiness as *glücklich*, superficial happiness as *happy*, pronounced [hepi].

Here, it is relevant to mention the problem of denotation and connotation. As it is known, denotation is a meaning of words, recognized by the majority of native speakers (i.e. lexical meaning of words). Connotation is a secondary associative meaning, shared by one or several native speakers. For example, the word "lion" means a predator of the feline genus (denotation), but in everyday communication this word may be a synonym of a courageous, strong person. The matter is that the primary meaning of a word is not something fixed and permanent. Word meanings change with time and epochs, from generation to generation, from year to year, as well as from region to region. A wrong choice of a word may lead to confusions, offence and incomprehension. Ignoring this fact may considerably complicate communication. If we take zoomorphic elements in various languages, we will see that different cultures ascribe to the same animal different traits. As a result, the names acquire different evaluative and emotive connotations. So, in Arabic, to compare somebody with *a dog* is an insult because Arabic culture sees a dog as a cowardly, mean animal. In Ukrainian, the dominant connotation will probably be blind devotion to the people one loves. In Turkish, one may find examples of even greater divergence: to compare a woman with a *horse* means complementing her on good looks; a young, athletically built man may be compared with a *ram* and mothers often use this form of address (along with *my lion cub*) to show their affection; a *cat* is associated with greed and ingratitude; an *ostrich* is a mean, two-faced, calculating person. Etymologically, the Turkish word for *ostrich* is a compound, literally equivalent to "*bird-camel*". Probably this pattern of word formation was the reason for the Turkish saying "*When the ostrich is asked to carry some load it says "I'm a bird"; when it is asked to fly, it says "I'm a camel"*."

Whereas some lexical differences may be easily explained by geographical peculiarities of the region, others obviously bear an imprint of culture. As a rule, these are abstract nouns and social phenomena. Let us take social phenomena first.

While differences in concepts of material objects can present certain difficulties in communication and translation, still they do not really matter much and are easily cleared out and overcome. However, culture influences abstract concepts to a much greater extent and it is

in this sphere where the absence of equivalence between two languages causes misunderstandings. (It should be noted in passing that concrete elements in Western languages are of diminishing importance. It will suffice to look at an example of a medieval code, scientific text, or book title in order to understand to what degree Western languages have become abstract. They are the opposite to languages of pre-industrialized societies. Thus, American Indian languages often have no word for "*eyesight*", but contain words that denote "*eye of a human being*" and "*eye of an animal*" [Boas 1998; Osterloh 1998, p. 82].) It is relevant to quote here Edward T.Hall who discovered that the Hopi Indians had difficulty understanding the mythical world of Christianity because they had no abstract, empty spaces without reference to their sensory experience. Heaven as a concept just didn't fit Hopi thought [Hall 1989, p. 30]

Anna Wierzbicka has studied the concept, conveyed by the word *friend*, and the concept, delivered by the Russian word *друг*. The English *friend* (especially in American English) can be used to denote a person with whom one got acquainted in a bar and later on whom one meets by chance in the street. In other words, the English *friend* does not presuppose particularly close and intimate relationships based on mutual sincerity, trust, willingness to help. All these semantic components are characteristic of the Russian word *друг*. The fact that one may talk about *"a trip to Salzburg with ten friends"* makes it even more prominent that *friends* stands for people with whom one has a good time without being particularly involved emotionally (compare also *Your grandfather was a friend, but we spoke mostly business* from *The Da Vinci Code* by Dan Brown). In Russian (and, obviously, in Ukrainian), the word *друг* has a much more specific meaning. One cannot have *десять друзей*. When talking about people in such contexts, Russians are more likely to use the words *приятель*, because *друг* is said about somebody unique, that is, in singular. As for the situation in a bar, a Russian would sooner introduce him as *знакомый* (for more details see p. 92–93). Thus, the seeming equivalence may conceal quite different concepts. As a result, "equivalent" words from two languages may have different valency, stylistic and sociocultural connotations.

Similar differences are observed in the concept "family". To many peoples in Western Europe, "family" comprises next of kin: father, mother, brothers and sisters. At a pinch the grandparents are accepted within the circle, but people may start having problems with the inclusion of uncles and aunts; cousins are accepted only in exceptional circumstances. In southern Europe and Latin America, the concept of "family" covers many more people than in the North: cousins are certainly part of the concept of "family". The Dutch distinguish between *gezin*, meaning the unit of father, mother and children, and *familie*, meaning other relatives "sharing a common ancestor". In English, the word "family" is used in both senses.

Semantic divergence between equivalent abstract words in different languages is, as a rule, caused by cultural or mentality differences. So, both the USA inhabitant and a Mexican may talk about respect for one another, however the concept expressed by the English *respect* is essentially different from what is called *respecto*. For an American, *respect* is connected with key values of his/her culture – with the idea of equality and democracy. There are no emotional connotations in the concept of *respect*. In the US, a citizen respects others in the same way as he/she respects, say, the law. For a Mexican, *respecto* is an emotionally coloured word. It implies pressure or power, a possible threat as well as the "love-hatred" relation. The meaning of *respecto* envisages a system of principles to which a person may stick voluntarily [Condon 1998, p. 88]. This striking semantic divergence is even more surprising due to the fact that these two words are obvious borrowings, derived from the same stem.

If we consider such a German word as *Angst*, it will reveal its difference from the Russian *тревога* and English *anxiety* in that it contains fear of some specific kind. Whereas *anxiety* is uneasiness about some particular situation, *Angst* is usually certain inner fear. Its sources are unclear for a person but its possible consequences seem to the person gruesome, global and irretrievable. Such a specific meaning of the German word has led to the fact that it has been borrowed by English speakers and is now used mainly in the collocation "*existential angst*".

The encoding of experience differs in the nature of the natural associations evoked by different linguistic signs. For example, al-

though the words *soul* or *mind* are usually seen as the English equivalents of the Russian *∂уша*, each of these signs is differently associated with their respective objects. For a Russian, not only is *∂уша* used more frequently than *soul* or *mind* in English but through its associations with religion and goodness, and the mystical essence of things it connotes quite a different concept than the English words.

As it turns out, a word may be related to the other words and instances of text and talk that have accumulated in a community's memory over time. Thus, the Russian *∂уша*, which roughly denotes "a person's inner core", it connotes goodness and truth because it is linked to other utterances spoken and heard in daily life, to literary quotes, or to other verbal concepts such as pricelessness, human will, inner speech, knowledge, feelings, thoughts, religion, that themselves have a variety of connotations. When English speakers translate the word *∂уша* by the word *soul,* they are in fact linking it to other English words, i.e. *disembodied spirit, immortal self, emotions,* that approximate but don't quite match the semantic cohesion established for *∂уша* in the Russian culture. The meanings of words cannot be separated from other words with which they have come to be associated in the discourse community's semantic pool.

Grammatical level. Among the most frequent elements used in various languages to signal grammatical structure are word order, inflection (bound morphemes), correlation of forms and function words. The differences, observed in grammar, may be quite striking. For example, native speakers of English, Spanish and many other languages that distinguish only between "one" and "more than one" (i.e. singular and plural) as grammatical contrast tend to believe that all languages must make this distinction. Yet, some languages make a three-member distinction: "one", "two", "more than two" (i.e. singular, dual, plural). Other languages make a four-member opposition: "one", "two", "three", "more than three" (singular, dual, trial, plural), while others make no grammatical distinction as to number at all.

Slavonic students of the English language encounter difficulties in the use of the articles, since the "definiteness/indefiniteness" category is strange to their native tongues.

In some languages, nouns have the category of gender: masculine, feminine and, sometimes, neuter. The gender characteristics may at

times have no biological ground: it is quite natural that German *Frau,* Italian *donna,* Ukrainian *жінка* are feminine, but why are German, Italian and Ukrainian equivalents of English *book* (*das Buch, il libro, книга*) neuter, masculine and feminine respectively? Their gender status, just like the gender status of the majority of words, is arbitrary. What is more amazing, in some African languages, nouns that denote big objects (or big and strong animals) are treated as masculine, whereas names of small objects (or small and weak animals) are feminine.

A more profound difference is the widely discussed observation by Benjamin Whorf that in the language of the Hopi Indians there is no notion of the time as we conceive it. The very notion of thinking without reference to time is difficult for us even to imagine:

> "I find it gratuitous to assume that a Hopi who knows only the Hopi language and the cultural ideas of his own society has the same notions, often supposed to be intuitions, of time and space that we have, and that are generally assumed to be universal. In particular, he has no general notion or intuition of TIME as a smooth, flowing continuum in which everything in the universe proceeds at an equal rate, out of a future, through a present, into a past, or in which, to reverse the picture, the observer is being carried in the stream of duration continuously away from a past into a future. After a long and careful study and analysis the Hopi language is seen to contain no words, grammatical forms, constructions or expressions that refer directly to what we call TIME, or to past, present, or future, or to enduring or lasting, or to motion as kinematic rather than dynamic (i.e. as a continuous translation in space and time rather than as an exhibition of dynamic effort in a certain process) or that even refer to space in such a way as to exclude that element of extension or existence that we call TIME, and so by implication leave a residue that could be referred to as TIME. Hence, the Hopi language contains no reference to TIME either explicit or implicit."

According to Whorf, whereas English speakers conceive of time as a linear, objective sequence of events, encoded in a system of past, present, and future tenses (e.g. *He ran* or *He will run*), or a discrete number of days as encoded in cardinal numerals (e.g. *ten days*), the Hopi conceive of it as intensity and duration in the analysis and reporting of experience (e.g. *wari = He ran* or statement of fact; *wari-kni = He ran* or statement of fact from memory). Similarly, *They stayed ten days* becomes in Hopi *They stayed until the eleventh day* or *They left after the tenth day.*

Whorf insisted that the English language binds English speakers to a Newtonian view of objectified time, neatly bound and classifiable, ideal for record-keeping, time-saving, clock-punching, that cuts up reality into "afters", and "untils", but is incapable of expressing time as a cyclic, unitary whole. By contrast, the Hopi language does not regard time as measurable length, but as relation between two events in lateness, a kind of "eventing" referred to in an objective way (as duration) and in a subjective way (as intensity). "Nothing is suggested about time [in Hopi] except the perpetual "getting later" of it", writes Whorf. Thus it would be very difficult, Whorf argues, for an English and a Hopi physicists to understand each other's thinking, given the major differences between their languages. Despite the general translatability from one language into another, there will always be an incommensurable residue of untranslatable culture associated with the linguistic structure of any given language.

Languages also differ syntactically, namely, they have different basic order of sentence parts. Japanese uses the order Subject – Object – Verb, and classical Arabic has Verb – Subject – Object, which creates difficulties for people who are used to Subject – Verb – Object. The position of an attribute to the modified word varies as well: the Romance languages are the case when postposition prevails, whereas in the Germanic and the Slavonic languages attributes are mostly in pre-position.

The correct use of interactional rules is just as important as correct pronunciation, choice of vocabulary and grammar. The interactional rules concern such issues as "who opens a conversation", "who is allowed to interrupt the speaker", "how one places an interruption", "what facial expression one uses to show interest" as well as

other verbal and non-verbal signals that show that the speaker and the listener are aware of how to carry on a conversation politely and properly. It is often in the area of *pragmatics* that foreigners make errors by producing phrases that are literal translations of what they would say in their own language (e.g. a Dutch lady offering another cup of coffee to her British guest, saying "I still have some coffee." Her guest found it very hard to understand that she was being offered another cup of coffee, since this phrase meant something completely different to her).

Another case of pragmatic usage is, for example, a teacher's polite request, expressed in the interrogative sentence (typical of English). Students from Arabic countries may take such formulas at their face-value and therefore interpret as the teacher's wish to know their preferences:

> TEACHER: Would you like to read this passage aloud, please?
> STUDENT: Er...well, no, thank you very much.

As it happens, we sometimes use roundabout ways instead of saying directly what we mean. Usually, the very situation helps to decipher the meaning of an utterance. These "roundabout" utterances are called **conversationl implicatures**, i.e. we imply and the conversational situation helps to explicate the intended meaning (some jokes are based on taking conversational implicatures at their face value, e.g.

> - Waiter, waiter, there's a fly in my soup!
> - It's all right, sir, it can swim/I'm sorry, sir, I didn't know you wanted to dine alone/Don't worry, sir, the spider on the roll will catch it).

One more example of pragmatic peculiarities in communication may be the way people compliment and the way they react to compliments. Here, it is relevant to mention the following episode that happened in France: a couple, where the wife is of Asian origin, invited guests to dinner. The French guests wanted to compliment the food, noted that it was delicious and, as it is normal in their culture, started discussing what might be added to dishes to improve the

taste. This discussion sent the poor hostess into tears because she took it as a hint that her cooking was not good enough.

In Spain there are two types of compliments, with different functions and norms of appropriacy. The first, *piropo*, is almost exclusively sexual, used in the street generally by men and directed at women, and non-reciprocal. The second, *cumplido*, is broader and almost always requires a response. Some Spanish speakers point out that *cumplido* compliments are essentially insincere or hypocritical. For example, one conventional *cumplido* is the daughter-in-law's compliment about her mother-in-law's cooking. Such compliments are so expected, so much part of the pattern everyday life, that they are not invested with any significance [Barro et al. 1998, p.95].

Reactions to compliments also depend on cultural peculiarities. For example, Americans have been socialized into responding *Thank you* to any compliment, as if they were acknowledging a friendly gift: "*I like your sweater*!" – "*Oh, thank you*." The French, who tend to perceive such a compliment as an intrusion into their privacy, would rather downplay the compliment and minimize its value: "*Oh really? It's already old!*" The reactions of the both groups are based on the differing degrees of embarrassment caused by personal comments [Kramsch 1998, p. 7].

Ways of intensification are also culturally specific. For example, English speakers who belong to certain discourse communities may intensify denotative meanings by ironically elongating the vowel of a word (*It's beau:::::::tiful!*). In French, intensification is often done not through elongating of the vowel, but through rapid reiteration of the same form: *Vite vite vite vite vite! Dépèchez-vous!* These different prosodic encodings form distinct ways of speaking that are often viewed as typically English or French.

The following is another example from Japanese. Like many other languages, English included, there is a way to express apology. In English, we commonly say: "excuse me, I'm sorry, pardon me" and the like when we want to convey the fact that we have inconvenienced another person in some way. In Japanese, "excuse me" is generally translated as *sumimasen* and in many instances it corresponds in use to the English equivalent, such as when trying to get the attention of a stranger to ask the time. However, Japanese also uses this

word in circumstances that are confusing to English speakers because it is not the way English speakers generally think about "excuse me" in English. While an English speaker generally ends a phone conversation with "good-bye" or the like, in Japanese it is common to say *sumimasen!* In this instance, the intention of the Japanese speaker is to apologize for taking up the person's time of the phone, thus *sumimasen* is the appropriate way to express this feeling. To complicate this scenario even further, as the English speaker of Japanese might want to express a good-bye to end the phone call, he/she might wrongly use *sayoonara* (literally "good-bye"), which is not used on the phone! [Gore 2007, p.93-94]

One should not forget also the special feelings each speaker holds for his/her native language as well as associations and stereotypes, accompanying other languages. Bilingual speakers are very good indicators of these language connotations. Translating originally English *Lolita* into Russian, V.Nabokov, complained that intimate details sounded naturally and gracefully in English but appeared clumsy and voluminous in Russian.

Here are two abstracts illustrating that a language for a human is more than just a sign system. In the first example, two lovers, Indians by origin but living in London, though speaking English to each other most of the time, still switch to Hindi to feel really close. The second example shows that a foreign language may be associated by a writer with freedom, whereas the native tongue is tightly bound in the writer's consciousness with the totalitarian regime. Cf:

> I was beginning to think that although we both spoke English, we spoke in different dialects. It wasn't that way later, when we spoke Hindi, as we sometimes did in the middle of phone conversations... I thought he was using them [*Hindi words*] to bring us closer together, stand on the same piece of rock. [SALM, p. 101]
>
> Крістева говорить про боротьбу з перекладанням себе на іншу мову. Французька дала їй еротичну волю, "дозволила вібрувати й визволитись від наказів, забутих болгарською." [ГМЄ, с. 103]

The breakthrough in research of the "language - culture" problem took place in the 20th century when scientists could explain the relation between language, thought and culture. As a result, language was established as important factor of cultural heritage. It is language that helps to preserve, maintain and pass on a certain culture. In other words, culture is reflected in language. That is why mastering a language means, on the one hand, mastering the cultural values, accumulated by the society, and, on the other hand, mastering the values is impossible without mastering the language.

The initiators of research into correlation between culture and language were the American cultural anthropologist **Franz Boas** (1858–1942) and the British social anthropologist **Bronislaw Malinowski** (1884–1942). In 1911, Boas pointed out this relation and illustrated the comparison between two cultures with the help of lexical analysis. He noticed that for the majority of Northern Americans, snow is a usual phenomenon and they have only two words to denote this phenomenon – *snow* and *slush*. The language of Eskimos in Alaska has over 20 words describing snow in various states. This diversity shows that for the Eskimo people, snow is not just a meteorological factor but its most important part, the basis of most elements of Eskimo culture.

The anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski was working at describing the fishing and agricultural practices of the native inhabitants of the Trobriand Islands when he discovered for the first time that their language (Kiriwinian) was the key to understanding the meaning of their practices. But, as he sat on the beach, observing the fishermen cry out from one canoe to the other, manoeuvering their boats across difficult straits, he realized that, on order to understand what was going on, it was not enough to understand and write down the meaning of their words. One had to understand why they said what they said and how they said it to whom in a specific context of situation. In addition, one had to link their words, beliefs, and mindsets to a larger context of culture such as: tribal economy, social organization, kinship patterns, fertility rites, seasonal rhythms, concepts of time and space.

Works by these authors were followed by other studies that offer research into the language–culture correlation from different view-

points. Thus, language was interpreted as socio-cultural phenomenon, mastering of languages was compared with entering other cultures. Also, scholars started to investigate cultural and language stereotypes, worldviews, etc.

In the middle of the 20th century, scientists arrived at the conclusion that language and culture are interdependent, though the influence of culture on language is far more obvious. By now, there have been several approaches to the problem.

The first approach has been worked out by Russian scholars (e.g. A.G. Brutyan, Y.I. Kukushkin, E.S. Markaryan, S.A. Artanovsky) who believe that relation between language and culture is movement in one direction. They claim that, since language reflects the world and culture is inseparable part of the world, language is a mere reflection of culture. Changes in the world lead to corresponding changes in culture, which impacts language. This approach leaves open the issue of reverse influence of language on culture.

The second approach is the hypothesis of linguistic relativity, suggested by Edward Sapir and Benjamin Whorf. In their opinion, people see the world in different ways – through their language. Thus, language is not a mere instrument to reproduce thoughts: language forms our thoughts itself. Proponents of this point of view believe that we see the world in the way it is reflected in our language: speakers of different languages see the world differently.

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is based on the statement that language is the foundation of a worldview that forms and harmonizes an enormous number of things and phenomena. The hypothesis suggests the following postulates:

- Language determines thoughts.
- The way of cognition depends on the language of cognition.

According to the hypothesis, any object or phenomenon become comprehensible for us only if it is given a name. Accordingly, an object or a phenomenon without a name do not exist for us as such. Having formulated any name, we include a new concept in the system of concepts that already exist in our brain. In other words, we introduce a new element in our worldview. So, language does not

just reflect the world, it builds an ideal world in our brain, it controls the second world, which is actually the first the individual deals with before turning to real life objects. The individual sees the world just in the way the individual speaks. That is why speakers of different languages see the world differently.

According to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, every language has its own way of presenting the world. If an object is explained with a system of several concepts (synonyms), the object is marked with great importance for the given community. For example, in classic Arabic, there used to be about 600 words to denote a camel, specifying its colour, frame, sex, age, movements, etc. A lot of them have already disappeared from the language because the importance of a camel in everyday life has deteriorated.

One of the drawbacks of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is that linguistic relativity would restrict the language potential within the framework of a culture. In fact, one of the main features of a language is its universality that permits the individual to use language as a means of communication in all situations of communication, interaction with other cultures included. It is language universality that helps the individual to carry out communication both within and across cultures.

The hypothesis has stimulated research into problems of correlation between language, thought and culture, which has led to the third approach. It sees language and culture as interdependent (e.g. works by B.A.Serebrennikov and R.M.Frumkina). The postulates of this approach are as follows:

- language is a component of a culture inherited from ancestors;
- language is the main tool that helps to learn a culture;
- language is the most important manifestation of a culture.

These postulates mean that the human, a bearer of a culture and a speaker, stands between language and the world. It is the human that perceives the world by senses and creates concepts. In other words, the human rationally processes the world in concepts and reasoning that may be passed to other people. Thus, the world and the language are mediated by thought.

In this connection, one cannot but mention works by Anna Wierzbicka. In the book *Understanding Cultures through Their Key*

Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese, she argues that languages reflect and simultaneously form people's values, ideals and worldviews. Corresponding language units are priceless clues to these aspects of culture.

It is important to note that Anna Wierzbicka recognizes the universal foundation for different ways of world conceptualization. According to Wierzbicka, any complex concept, encoded in a language unit, may be presented as a certain configuration of elementary units. These units – semantic primes that form natural semantil metalanguage (NSM) – are semantically indiscrete and universal, i.e. they are lexically encoded in all human languages. The list of these semantic primes is constantly elaborated, but this does not affect the linguist's hypothesis that any specific language concept may be explicated with the help of Lingua Mentalis. Here is an example of how Wierzbicka presents the concepts *friend* and *друг* with the help of semantic primes:

friend:
(a) anyone knows: many people think of some other people so:
(b) I know this person very well
(c) I think of this person good things
(d) I want this person to know what I think
(e) I want this person to know what I feel
(f) I don't want many people to know these things
(g) I want to do good things for this person
(h) I know that this person thinks the same of myself
(i) When I think of this person I feel something very good
(j) I think so of this person.

друг:
(a) anyone knows: many people think of some other people so:
(b) I know this person very well
(c) I think of this person very good things
(d) I want to be with this person often
(e) I want to speak with this person often (say to this person some things)

(f) I know: I can say this person anything
(g) Nothing bad will happen because of this
(h) I want this person to know what I think
(i) I want this person to know why I think so
(j) I want this person to know what I feel
(k) I want to do good things for this person
(l) When something bad happens to this person, I cannot help doing something good for this person
(m) I know that this person thinks the same of myself
(n) When people think so of other people, they feel something very good
(o) I think so of this person [Вежбицкая 2001, с.98, 114]

You can also compare the scientist's findings above with the following impression of an immigrant to Great Britain:

> "[*У меня в Англии* – *I.A.*] масса приятелей, а друзей в нашем, русском, смысле нет. Друг у нас – это человек, к которому ты можешь прийти, чтобы пожаловаться, довериться, положиться. Здесь полагаться можно только на себя. Друг у друга здесь десятку не стреляют... Люди, приходя в гости, занимаются чисто интеллектуальной стимуляцией друг друга." [АМЗЖ, с. 146]

This approach is undoubtedly helpful in that it provides researchers with instruments to explicate the slightest semantic differences of seemingly identical concepts. The method suggested by Wierzbicka also enables to explain the most unnoticeable semantic nuances of words that stand for key values in a culture (cf. her analysis of the concepts that lie behind the words *liberty, freedom, грусть, Angst* etc.). Still, elaboration of Lingua Mentalis makes us ignore differences between words – semantic primitives, e.g. there must be difference between *хотеть* and *want*, or between *ты* and *you* (the latter does not contain an element of informality, since there is no *ты – вы* opposition in English).

Consequently, the word reflects not so much the object or phenomenon of the world, the word reflects human perception that occurs through the worldview perspective in human consciousness. The

worldview is determined by culture, since human consciousness is formed both as a result of individual experience as well as enculturation (i.e. learning of ancestors' experience). Thus, language is not a mere mirror, automatically reflecting the environment but a perspective, unique in every culture, through which people look at the world. Language, thought and culture are so much interrelated that constitute a unity and cannot function without each other.

Relations between language and culture may be seen as relations between a part and a whole. Language may be treated as component of culture and as its instrument. But at the same time, language is autonomous from culture in general, it may be considered a separate autonomous semiotic system. Since every speaker is simultaneously a bearer of culture, language signs are able to perform functions of cultural signs. That is why language can reflect mentality of its speakers.

Modern linguistics claims that language performs various functions but the main of these functions is communicative. Language presupposes communication and is the main among its means. Since culture as specific human way of adaptation to the world is also *communication*, then relation between language, culture and communication is natural and unbreakable.

Reading and assignments

1. *Read the following abstracts and answer questions:*

Text 1. EDWARD SAPIR: *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language and Personality.* Edited by David G.Mandelbaum. University of California Press 1949, p.162.

This is a well-known statement from linguist and anthropologist Edward Sapir that grew out of his studies of American Indian languages. In this passage, Sapir lays the ground for the principle of linguistic relativity.

Language is a guide to "social reality". Though language is not ordinarily thought of as of essential interest to the students of social science, it powerfully conditions all our thinking about social problems and processes. Human beings do not live in the objective world

alone, not alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the "real world" is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached… we see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation.

- *Why do you think Sapir distinguishes between "distinct worlds" and "the same world with different labels attached"?*
- *Is Sapir claiming here that our language* determines *the way we think?*

Text 2. EDWARD SAPIR. *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language and Personality*. Edited by David G.Mandelbaum. University of California Press 1949, p.157–159

According to the principle of linguistic relativity, culture is encoded in the lexicon and the syntax of a language and the following examples illustrate this. We have to ask ourselves, however, if the very description in English *of linguistic phenomena experienced by speakers of other languages* in their respective languages *can ever correspond to their own experience of their language. Linguistic relativity applies also to the description of linguistic phenomena.*

When we observe an object of the type that we call a "stone" moving through space towards the earth, we involuntarily analyze the phenomenon into two concrete notions, that of a state and that of an act of falling, and, relating these two notions to each other by certain formal methods proper to English, we declare that "the stone falls". We assume, naively enough, that this is about the only analysis that can properly be made. And yet, if we look into the way that

other languages take to express this very simple kind of expression, we soon realize how much may be added to, subtracted from, or rearranged in our own form of expression without materially altering our report of the physical fact.

In German and in French, we are compelled to assign "stone" to a gender category; …in Chippewa we cannot express ourselves without bringing in the apparently irrelevant fact that a stone is an inanimate object. If we find gender beside the point, the Russian may wonder why we consider it necessary to specify in every case whether a stone, or any other object for that matter, is conceived in a definite or an indefinite manner, why the difference between "the stone" and "a stone" matters. "Stone falls" is good enough for Lenin, as it was good enough for Cicero… The Kwakiutl Indian of British Columbia may… wonder why we do not go a step further and indicate in some way whether the stone is visible or invisible to the speaker at the moment of speaking and whether it is nearest to the speaker, the person addressed, or some third party… We insist on expressing the singularity of the falling object, where the Kwakiutl Indian, differing from the Chippewa, can generalize and make a statement which would apply equally well to one or several stones. Moreover, he need not specify the time of the fall. The Chinese get on with a minimum of explicit formal statement and content themselves with a frugal "stone fall". …In the Nootka language the combined impression of a stone falling is quite differently analyzed. The stone need not be specifically referred to, but a single word, a verb form, may be used… "it stones down".

> • *How far is Sapir's view here consistent with the remark in Text 3 that "there is a strand of common sense that insists that a stone is a stone whatever you call it"? How common is common sense?*
> • *What cultural meanings might be expressed by each of these different encodings of the stone-falling event?*

Text 3. STEVEN PINKER: *The Language Instinct.* Harper 1995, p. 60–61

As a cognitive scientist, Steven Pinker uses psychological arguments to shoot down Whorf's claim about the relationship of language and thought.

What led Whorf to this radical position? He wrote that the idea first occurred to him in his work as a fire prevention engineer when he was struck by how language led workers to misconstrue dangerous situations. For example, one worker caused a serious explosion by tossing a cigarette into an "empty" drum that in fact was full of gasoline vapor. Another lit a blowtorch near a "pool of water" that was really a basin of decomposing tannery waste, which, far from being "watery", was releasing inflammable gases. Whorf's studies of American languages strengthened his conviction. For example, in Apache, *It is a dripping spring* must be expressed as "*Water, or springs, whiteness moves downward.*" "How utterly unlike our way of thinking!" he wrote.

But the more you examine Whorf's arguments, the less sense they make. Take the story about the worker and the "empty" drum. The seeds of disaster supposedly lay in the semantics of *empty*, which, Whorf claimed, means both "without its usual contents" and "Null and void, empty, inert". The hapless worker, his conception of reality molded by his linguistic categories, did not distinguish between the "drained" and "inert" senses, hence, flick…boom! But wait. Gasoline vapor is invisible. A drum with nothing but vapor in it looks just like a drum with nothing in it at all. Surely this walking catastrophe was fooled by his eyes, not by the English language.

The example of whiteness moving downward is supposed to show that the Apache mind does not cut up events into distinct objects and action. Whorf presented many such examples from Native American languages. The Apache equivalent of *The boat is grounded on the beach* is "It is on the beach pointwise as an event of canoe motion". *He invites people to a feast* becomes "He, or somebody, goes for eaters of cooked food." …All this, to be sure, is utterly unlike our way of talking. But do we know what it is utterly unlike our way of thinking?

As soon as Whorf's articles appeared, the psycholinguists Eric Lenneberg and Roger Brown pointed out two non sequitur in his argument. First Whorf did not actually study any Apaches, it is not clear that he ever met one. His assertions about Apache psychology are based entirely on Apache grammar – making his argument circular. Apache speak differently, so they must think differently. How do we know that they think differently? Just listen how they speak!

Second, Whorf rendered the sentences as clumsy, word-for-word translation, designed to make the literal meaning seem as odd as possible. But looking at the actual glosses that Whorf provided, I could, with equal grammatical justification, render the first sentence as mundane "Clear stuff – water – is falling". Turning the tables, I could take the English sentence "He walks" and render it as "solitary masculinity, leggedness proceeds".

- *In the first two paragraphs, Pinker seems to claim that people are guided by their senses more than by the language that surrounds them. Do you agree?*
- *Pinker pushes Whorf's claims* ad absurdum. *How would you respond to each of these two arguments?*

2. *Read the examples of behaviour patterns and language etiquette expected from people in different cultures and answer the questions below:*

On rare occasions that we go to a club Laura forgets she's an up-for-it Aussie girl. She follows etiquette dictated by British shyness and shuffles on the spot for ten tracks before dancing. But tonight she has rediscovered her roots and is refusing to be intimidated. [PAH, p. 58]

I was newly separated from my husband. Oscar left when Eddie was six months old. He said he needed to find himself, which is male-coward-speak for, "I've met someone else." This left me in what the British would call "a tight spot" and we guys from down under would call "up shit creek without a paddle." [PAH, p.9]

"Your card, your address,' he simply repeated.

"My address?" said mademoiselle. Then, with a little shrug: "Happily for you, you are an American! It is the first time I ever gave my card to a gentleman." [JHA, p.10]

- *What discrepancies do the abstracts reveal?*
- *Give several examples of misunderstandings or conflicts that arose in communication due to different behaviour patterns accepted in the speakers' cultures.*

3. *Comment on the quotation from* Language *by Edward Sapir:*

The linguistic student should never make the mistake of identifying a language with its dictionary.

Compare the quotation with the following abstract:

For bilingual speakers, it is sometimes efficient to choose items from the language not being used. Speakers may not have the proper entry to match the intention, the second language may have a more exacting expression for the concept, or pragmatic or contextual factors may make the selection of the second language more effective. [Bialistok 1995, p. 132–133]

> • *Have you encountered situations when you felt like using a word from a language different from the language of the interaction? Comment on these situations.*

4. *Read the abstract on pragmatic differences across languages and answer the questions below:*

Speech acts differ cross-culturally not only in the way they are realized but also in their distribution, their frequency of occurrence, and in the functions they serve.

In American English, compliments occur in a very wide variety of situations. They are quite frequent and they serve to produce or reinforce a feeling of solidarity between speakers… Compliments also serve other functions: they are used in greeting, thanking, and apologizing, or even as substitutes for them. They also serve as a way to open a conversation. The frequency of compliments in American English is often remarked upon by foreigners.

…also distribution varies a great deal from culture to culture. Americans give compliments in situations where the compliment would be totally inappropriate in other cultures [*e.g. an American politician complimented his French counterpart on his good job. In French press it was regarded as interference in French internal affairs*].

Complimenting behaviour…may be extremely frequent, as in our own culture, or it may hardly exist at all, as among the Indonesians. It may be realized as a formula or even as a ritualized precooked phrase or a proverb. It may well be uninterpretable cross-culturally since the values and attitudes it expresses vary so much from one society to another. [Wolfson 1998, p. 119]

- *Choose a speech act and compare it verbalization in two different cultures as to its syntactic structure (in case of compliments these are* What a nice/lovely/wonderful N!, It is Adj, I love/adore/admire your N, *etc.), set/free vocabulary, situations when they are expected and reactions to these speech acts.*

5. *Cross-cultural communication involves the problem of translation. Some cases present really enormous difficulties (e.g. how shall we translate into German, where all nouns are capitalized and German* Herr *also means* God*,* "людина з великої літери"*?). Get ready to define the term "*adequate translation*" and think whether it is possible as such. Before answering these questions, read the following abstract:*

– Сева, что вы переводите из литературных произведений?

– Сложный вопрос. Я не просто переводчик. Я как бы сижу на культурном заборе, на мне замыкаются оба потока. Я точно знаю, что переводить можно только общечеловеческие ценности. В России все идет на надрыве. Англичанам кажется, что мы каждую секунду переигрываем. Русская драматургия кончилась здесь на Чехове. Чехов им близок, потому что там есть вопрос о земле. У каждого англичанина есть сад, ему про это интересно. Или вот, например, плохой спектакль студии "Человек" про то, как пьют чинзано, имел успех в Шотландии, где каждый второй – пьяница. Это очень тонкое дело, поэтому я стараюсь не переводить, а адаптировать. [АММЗЖ 1999, с.150]

6. *(a) Read the abstracts from* Meaning and Culture *by Anna Wierzbicka and get ready to comment on the term "cultural script" and the goal of the linguist's research.*

The way we speak reflects the way we think. Not necessarily at the individual level— a skilled speaker can conceal his or her way of thinking behind carefully chosen words and phrases. At the social level, however, ways of speaking do reflect ways of thinking, in particular, as Franz Boas (1911) emphasized nearly a century ago, ways of thinking of which the speakers are not fully conscious. They reveal, and provide evidence for, *patterns* of thought.

Ways of thinking that are widely shared in a society become enshrined in ways of speaking. Ways of speaking change as the underlying ways of thinking change. There can be a lag between the two, but as one can see by studying ways of speaking at the times of revolutions and other dramatic social transformations, ways of speaking can change very quickly, too, in response to changes in prevailing attitudes. Of course, cultures are not "bound, coherent, timeless systems of meaning" (Strauss and Quinn 1997, 3). At the same time, however: Our experiences in our own and other societies keep reminding us that some understandings are widely shared among members of a social group, surprisingly resistant to change in the thinking of individuals, broadly applicable across different contexts of their lives, powerfully motivating sources of their action, and remarkably stable over succeeding generations. (Strauss and Quinn 1997, 3)

Common expressions and common speech routines involving those expressions are particularly revealing of social attitudes. (…) To penetrate this "covert richness of meaning," we need an adequate methodology.

I believe that such a methodology is available in the natural semantic metalanguage (NSM) theory of semantics and in the theory of cultural scripts that is its offshoot. (…) the key idea of NSM semantics is that all meanings can be adequately portrayed in empirically established universal human concepts, with their universal grammar. The key idea of the theory of cultural scripts is that widely shared and widely known ways of thinking can be identified in terms of the same empirically established universal human concepts, with their universal grammar. (...)

In the last few decades, cross-cultural investigations of ways of speaking have often been conceived in terms of an "ethnography of speaking" (Hymes 1962). This perspective provided a very healthy and necessary corrective to the one-sided search for a universal "logic of conversation" and for "universals of politeness" (see Wierzbicka 2003a). The theory of cultural scripts, however, proposes that we go still further and complement the ethnography of speaking with an ethnography of thinking, and it offers a framework within which such an ethnography of thinking can be meaningfully and methodically pursued.

I do not see the ethnography of thinking as an alternative to the ethnography of speaking or, more generally, to the "ethnography of social practices." On the contrary, I believe that we discover shared ways of thinking by studying ways of doing things, including ways of speaking, and further that the study of social practices, including linguistic practices, is best seen not as a goal in itself but rather as a path to understanding a society's attitudes and values. The theory of cultural scripts represents a cognitive approach to culture and society, and it offers a methodology that allows us to explore thinking, speaking, and doing in a unified framework.

The theory of cultural scripts combines an interest in the uniqueness and particularity of cultures with a recognition and affirmation of human universals, and it rejects the widespread perception that, ()…the enemy of the particular, the local, the idiosyncratic, the cultural is the universal, and the universal is always Bad News.

In the semantic theory of which the theory of cultural scripts is an offshoot, the universal is good news, and it is the universal—in the form of universal human concepts and their universal grammar—that gives us the tools for unlocking the secrets of the particular. Every human being, and every human group, is a blend of the universal and the particular. The theory of cultural scripts is based on the assumption that we need to understand people (both individuals and social groups) in their particularity, but that we can understand them best in terms of what is shared, and that one thing that is shared is a set of universal human concepts with their universal grammar. (...)

…the theory of cultural scripts differs from other attempts to describe and compare cultures in at least four major respects. First, it describes cultural norms and values from within rather than from outside. Thus, the researcher does not bring to the description of a culture external conceptual categories such as 'individualism', 'collectivism', 'rationalism', 'high context', and 'low context', as is usually done in the literature (e.g., Hall 1976; Hofstede 1980; Schwartz 1994). Rather, norms and values are always identified from within— that is, from the point of view of those people who are the bearers of the postulated norms and values (and in their own language). This means that there is no common grid, no set list of categories invented by the researcher and then "applied" to various human groups. Instead, norms and values are always

identified from the perspective of a given culture and presented in simple (nontechnical) formulae that are unique to that particular culture. Comparing different norms and values does not mean, in this approach, assigning different numerical scores to the *same* norms and values (e.g., 'individualism', 'collectivism', and so on). Rather, it means identifying norms and values that are unique to a given human group and tradition. At the same time, these unique norms and values are presented in a way that makes it possible to compare them: not through identical labels applied across the board but through identical building blocks out of which the different formulae are built.

This is the second major difference between the cultural script approach and all other approaches: the generalizations proposed are formulated in terms of a universal set of concepts, found in a word-like form in all languages. Thus, although no set of universal labels is introduced or relied on by the researcher, a set of universal concepts, which are actually found in all languages, is utilized and capitalized on. As a result, the proposed formulae are both unique and comparable: each is qualitatively different from all others, and yet each constitutes a configuration of the same elements—nonarbitrary, universal, and universally understandable.

The third distinctive feature of the cultural script approach is that it is practical: it can be used in language teaching, cross-cultural education, and intercultural communication. For example, when Hofstede (1980) asserts that cultures differ in their degree of 'masculinity', degree of 'collectivism', or degree of 'uncertainty avoidance', or when E. T. Hall (1976) compares cultures as 'high context' and 'low context', such generalizations can hardly help a language learner or an immigrant. By contrast, cultural scripts formulated in simple and universal human concepts are intuitively intelligible and can be immediately practically useful. For example, an immigrant to the United States, Britain, or Australia can be introduced to the following cultural script:

[people think like this:]
when I want someone to do something
I can't say to this person: "you have to do it because I want you to do it"

This script can later be refined and expanded, and its implications for acceptable and unacceptable ways of speaking can be explored in detail, but even in this basic form it is likely to be useful. The concomitant negative script would also be useful to the newcomer:

[people think like this:]
when I don't want someone to do something
I can't say to this person: "you can't do it because I don't want you to do it"

The fourth distinctive feature of the cultural script approach is that it relies on hard linguistic evidence. In books where a culture's "dominant cultural patterns" and "value orientations" are described in terms of "individualism," "conformity," "mutability," or "low context," descriptions of this kind are usually not required to be supported by specific linguistic facts. In the cultural script approach, however, all generalizations must be so supported. For example, the two Anglo scripts formulated above are justified with reference to conversational routines such as "could you / would you do X?" (the so-called whimperatives), used instead of a bare imperative ("do X!"), which developed late in modern English and were not used, for example, in Shakespeare's language (see Brown and Gilman 1989), or the semantics of speech act verbs like *to suggest* (that someone do something). [Wierzbicka 2006, p. 22–25]

(b) The abstract below summarizes peculiarities of English causative constructions. Think whether there may be other semantic nuances to the meaning of the constructions. Choose a grammatical or lexical phenomenon in English (or any other language) and think of its culturally specific features.

Ethnosyntax: Links between culture and grammar

While obviously words are carriers of meaning, it is less obvious that grammatical categories of a language also encode meaning. But in fact this is what grammar is all about: certain meanings are so important to communities of speakers that they become not just lexicalized (linked with individual words) but grammaticalized, that is, embodied in the language's structural patterns. Languages differ widely not only, as Sapir (1949 [1924], 27) put it, in the nature of their vocabularies but also in the nature of their grammar. Sapir's dictum "Distinctions which seem

inevitable to us may be utterly ignored in languages which reflect an entirely different type of culture, while these in turn insist on distinctions which are all but unintelligible to us" (p. 27) applies equally to vocabulary and to grammar.

… it is clearly not an accident that, for example, the Hanunyo language of the Philippines has dozens of words for different kinds of rice (see Conklin 1957), and to anyone who knows anything about Russian culture, it is clearly not an accident that Russian has an extremely rich and elaborate system of expressive derivation applicable to proper names (names of persons), whereas in languages like English the corresponding system of expressive derivation is extremely limited (compare, e.g., John and Johnny in English, vs. Ivan and Ваня, Ванечка, Ванюша, Ванюшка, Ванюшечка, and so on in Russian; for discussion, see Wierzbicka 1992, chapter 7; also Friedrich 1966). ....

If one looks at English in a comparative perspective, one is struck by its extremely rich repertoire of causative constructions. This wealth is concealed, to some extent, by the use of the same key words, such as make, have, or let, in many different constructions, all of which may appear to be examples of a single "make-construction," "have-construction," or "let-construction." In fact, there are reasons to distinguish, on both semantic and structural grounds, more than a dozen different make-constructions in English (…) and probably more than a dozen different have-constructions (…). As this chapter seeks to demonstrate, English has also a wide range of different let-constructions. To give just a few preliminary examples of the wealth of causative constructions found in English, let me mention the following eleven (…):

X made Y do something intentionally (e.g., X made Y wash the dishes)

X made Y do something unintentionally (e.g., X made Y cry)

X made Y adjective (e.g., X made Y furious)

X had Y do something (e.g., X had Y wash the dishes)

X had something done to X's Z (e.g., X had her boots mended)

X had Y doing something (e.g., X had Y staying with her)

X got Y to do something (e.g., X got Y to wash the dishes)

X got Y adjective (e.g., X got Y furious)

X got herself participle (e.g., X got herself kicked out)

X verbed Y into doing Z (e.g., X talked/tricked Y into resigning)

X verbed Y doing something (e.g., X kept Y waiting)

… if one compares English and Russian speech acts, one will discover that the English lexicon pays more attention to different strategies of human causation—just as English grammar pays more attention to this area than Russian grammar.

In trying to understand the extraordinary wealth of causative constructions found in modern English (not only in comparison with other European languages but also in a universal perspective), we should ask, I think, for its cultural roots. Why is it that so much attention is focused in English on the precise nature of causal relations between various actions and various events? I would like to put forward two interpretive hypotheses in this regard.

First, as democracy developed in modern society—initially, in America —a new style of human relations evolved, which had to accommodate an increased scale of interpersonal interactions and put those interactions on a new footing (see Stearns and Stearns 1986). The new managerial type of society, too, needed an increased scale of interpersonal causations: for the new society to function smoothly and efficiently, lots of people had to be told what to do. This had to happen, however, in the context of a democracy, where people might be willing to take "directions" or to follow "instructions" but not to obey "orders" or "commands."

But to talk of a shift from "orders" to "directions" and "instructions" is an oversimplification. In fact, a whole range of new concepts has developed and become socially salient, concepts to do with different kinds of interpersonal causation. For example, there are significant differences between "telling" someone to type up some letters, "ordering" someone to do so, "directing" them to do so, and "having some letters typed up." In modern Anglo society, the idea of "having things done" has become increasingly important; it suggests a setup that doesn't involve one person bending to the will of another and where many people are willing—in various spheres of life, such as office work or interaction at a service station—to do things that someone else wants them to do, while at the same time preserving their personal autonomy and full control over other areas of their personal lives.

The cultural emphasis on personal autonomy, characteristic of modern Anglo society and reflected in many ways in modern English (…), is no doubt closely related to the expansion of causative constructions in modern English, as is also the marked emphasis on the need for voluntary cooperation among equals (see Fukuyama 1995). In a large-scale society, where service encounters have come to occupy a vital role in everyday life and where people are acutely aware of their right to, and need for, personal autonomy, the nuances of causation assume an extraordinary importance.

For example, if I am working in a service profession (say, waiting tables or driving a taxi), my livelihood depends on my willingness to do what other people want me to do (and to do it because they say they want me to do it), but the relationship with my customers has to be negotiated in such a way that I don't abrogate my personal autonomy in the process. I am willing to "serve" my customers, but I am not willing to treat them as my superiors. If I am working in an institution such as a university or in public administration, I may well have "bosses," "superiors," or "heads of department," whose will I may have to bow to on an everyday basis. But if I am a modern Anglo person, I will not want to abrogate my personal autonomy because of this, and I will follow my bosses' will only in a context that ensures the recognition of both my autonomy and my essential "equality" with them. Even in the realm of family interaction, it has become crucial in the modern Anglo world that parental authority has to be exercised, and indeed conceived of, in ways that are consistent with the children's right to, and need for, personal autonomy.

All these modern ideas and expectations needed new ways of speaking and, I suggest, found their expression in the plethora of causative constructions so characteristic of nineteenth- and twentieth-century English. It is, of course, true that democracy reaches wide outside the Anglo world, and that so does the ethos of equality, of the rights of the individual, and of personal autonomy. It is not true, however, that the cultural emphasis on personal autonomy in the "Anglosphere" (cf. Bennett 2004) is equally characteristic of the German-speaking, Spanish-speaking, or Russian-speaking world (…).

There are considerable and partly grammaticalized differences in ways of speaking separating English from most other European lan-

guages, above all, differences in the use of the imperative. The extraordinary growth of various "whimperatives" in modern English (…), linked with the growing avoidance of the straight imperative, is an unparalleled phenomenon, with obvious cultural significance. In fact, the growth of conventional expressions such as "would you do X," "will you do X," "could you do X," and "would you mind doing X" – all aimed at avoiding the impression that one is trying to impose one's will on somebody else—seems to have proceeded in parallel with the growth of causative constructions and the emergence of new varieties of make-constructions, have-constructions, get-constructions, and especially let-constructions in modern English. [Wierzbicka 2006, p. 171–174]

English causative constructions, whose cultural elaboration is a distinctive typological feature of the English language, focus …on the freedom and autonomy of the person who is performing the action. It might be suggested that, leaving aside the lexical verb to force, the causative auxiliaries could be arranged on a scale from *let* to *make*, with *get* and *have* closer to *make*. …however, the differences are qualitative rather than quantitative, and to portray them adequately, we need to present each construction as a unique bundle of semantic components.

Arguably, the central question behind all these constructions is whether the person who is doing something is doing it out of his or her own volition. Thus, in the case of the main let-construction (as in "X let Y do Z"), person Y is doing something because he or she wants to do it, while another person, X, doesn't prevent Y from doing it. In the case of get-constructions, person Y is doing, voluntarily, something that another person, X, wants her or him to do. In the case of have-constructions, person Y is also doing something that another person, X, wants her or him to do, and in this case the relations between X and Y are such that Y cannot say (about something of this kind) "I don't want to do it"; here, too, Y is doing it "voluntarily" in the sense that Y doesn't think "I have to do it." In the case of make-constructions, Y is doing something that someone else, X, wants Y to do, and in this case Y does think: "I have to do it."

If we look at English in a comparative perspective, two things stand out most: the large number of causative auxiliaries (and an even larger

number of grammatical constructions associated with them) and the presence of an auxiliary verb, let, specialized in, roughly speaking, non-interference. These features of English are culturally revealing, as they both reflect a concern with personal autonomy. In addition, this concern is reflected in the plethora of more specialized constructions and expressions based on let that encode cultural meanings such as "tolerance," "sharing information," "offering to perform a service," "suggesting a joint action," "cooperative dialogue," "cooperative interaction," and "cooperative thinking."

Arguably, let, which as mentioned earlier has been described as "the central causative verb" of Middle English, is also the central causative verb of modern English. But the meaning of this central causative verb has changed–roughly speaking, from "causing someone to do something" to "not causing someone not to do something." This shift is symptomatic, as it suggests the same concern that (…) is reflected in the changes in the meaning of the word freedom itself–roughly, from "freedom to" to "freedom from." [Wierzbicka 2006, p. 202–203]

CHAPTER IV
Cross-Cultural Communication
and Typologies of Cultures

1. Types of communication

Communication is just as unlimited and varied as human society itself. This variety is reflected in types of communication. Modern communicative linguistics distinguishes between the following types of communication: *interpersonal, group, mass* and *cross-cultural*.

Interpersonal communication is a process of message exchange between two or more people. This type of communication plays the principal role in human socialization.

Interpersonal nature of communication presupposes immediate interaction of a small number of people, located close to each other and having the possibility to get feedback. This type of communication is always person-oriented, since it is based on participants' recognition of their partner's uniqueness, participants' regard for their partner's emotional state, personal qualities and their expectation of the partner's similar attention.

Group communication is an interaction in small groups. The number of people within small groups may be from three to 20 or 30 people. The optimal number in a small group usually equals 10–15 people. These groups are, as a rule, family, colleagues, friends, etc. In small groups, communication is directed simultaneously upwards, downwards as well as horizontally.

Group communication is based on shared knowledge, similar efforts, social validity of communication results. Its importance lies in that it forms intergroup harmony, co-ordinates actions, forms a spe-

cific group culture. Group communication organizes the group's joint actions, where every group member performs his/her part of activity and contributes to collective actions. The result of joint actions becomes the result of each person.

Mass communication came into being thanks to radio, TV, telephone, telex, cable and computer networks. It is an interaction of various social subjects; mass communication consists of mass information exchange that is facilitated by means of special technical devices. As a result, it ensures simultaneous participation of large groups of people. Its distinguishing features are technical devices that provide regularity and circulation of information; great social importance of information that forms participants' motivation; mass nature, anonymity and dispersion of communication subjects; a big number of channels and variation of communication means.

Mass communication performs a *cultural* function: it includes formation and reproduction of cultural values, information about cultural events and other peoples' achievements, preservation of national culture and traditions. As a result, mass communication forms a corresponding type of personality and influences further development of art. It is mass communication that makes people acquainted with peculiarities of various cultures and subcultures, develops aesthetic tastes, makes a society more integrated.

Cross-cultural communication is a specific type of communication between two or more representatives of different cultures which results in exchange of information. Cross-cultural communication is a specific type of activity which is not restricted to knowledge of foreign languages but also requires knowledge of other people's material and spiritual culture, their religion, values, moral principles, world view, etc., because they all predetermine behaviour. It is this unity – knowledge of a language and knowledge of a culture – that guarantees effective and fruitful interaction.

Cross-cultural communication may take place either on a group or interpersonal level. Still, on any level, a human is the main subject of cross-cultural communication. A person's behaviour is determined by values and norms of the culture where he/she is incorporated. That is why every participant of cross-cultural interaction operates within his/her own system of rules that result from

his/her socio-cultural background. Therefore, cross-cultural communication presupposes dealing both with language and with socio-cultural and ethnic differences.

On the *interpersonal level* of cross-cultural communication, success or failure depends, to a large extent, whether partners trust or do not trust each other. Trust is determined predominantly by two factors: firstly, the speaker's personal qualities and, secondly, his/her competence. The importance of these factors varies across cultures. In Eastern cultures, the partner's status and personal qualities are more essential than competence, in Western cultures – vice versa. It should be remembered that interpersonal cross-cultural communication is influenced by a number of other factors such as age, sex, profession, etc.

Communication in small, culturally mixed groups requires from its participants to adapt their actions to concrete goals, set by their group. Members of monocultural groups tend to stick to common group norms, whereas members of cross-cultural groups act as representatives of their cultures and may be guided by different values. Therefore in situations of CCC it is vital that partners realize that their behaviour is culturally conditioned and doesn't result from malicious intent.

CCC in groups may also take place on the *ethnic level*. In practice, it means interaction between local ethnic groups, ethnolanguage, ethnoconfessional and other communities. One may see here two distinct tendencies. On the one hand, interacting cultures mutually assimilate each other's achievements, exhibit integrating processes and enrich each other. On the other hand, cross-cultural communication on this level is accompanied by ever intensifying ethnic identification, aspiration to preserve and defend ethnic peculiarities.

Cross-cultural communication encourages contacts, bilingualism, increase in mixed marriages, etc. but does not, however, result in cultural homogeneity. Here, communication ends up with mutual or one-sided penetration of cultural elements, leaving cultural identities unchanged.

Thus, CCC embraces all communication types. It includes communication between cultures, religions and between subcultures within large cultures.

Cross-cultural distant communication

The term "distant communication" is used to denote communication by means of written texts. The term embraces peculiarities of

their creation and perception. It should be noted that distant communication is an extremely complex phenomenon, as there are many aspects involved: texts may be distant temporally, locally and both temporally and locally. In cross-cultural communication, people have to deal with texts that are created within other cultures and, at times, belong to different epochs.

The problem of culture-specific texts first arose when European scholars started to translate texts written by ancient Eastern scientists. The translators had to face the challenge of so-called secondary structures, since literal translation of Eastern texts did not provide adequate understanding. Such texts are based on *multi-layered semantics*: words perform two functions – to deliver information to the intended addressee and to hide it from others. Cf.:

> The Tibetan medical book reads: ""The king fell ill, the ministers are short of breath, the lords are sweating". This is actually a description of heart deficiency, where the king is a heart, the ministers — five parts of lungs, and the lords — swollen joints. [Мантатов 1985].

It is important to remember that the very *status of written texts* differs across cultures. In Arabic culture, the text of the Koran is regarded as something entirely mature, accomplished, and unalterable. Nearly the only way to handle such a text is to memorize and recite it.

> Rifa'a Tahtawi, the first Muslim imam to go to Paris, accompanying a group of Egyptian students in 1826, was impressed by French culture. In his Paris diary, he writes of his astonishment that French teachers did not adhere to tests in order to find the truth, whereas Islamic scholars at that time wrote merely "commentaries and supercommentaries" on traditional texts" [Tibi 2001, p. 67]

Nowadays, Western cultures treat texts as subject for critical analysis. Besides, the high status of the text within Western cultures is being deteriorating quite noticeably due to the Internet. As soon as

anyone can create and disseminate texts via the Net, the exclusive nature of "being a writer" has ceased to be the privilege of the few.

It is also important to remember that different cultures classify texts differently. The concept of *text type* establishes constraints on what one is expected to write about, in what form, for what audience. Thus, for example, religious leaders in Shi'a Islam make a difference between texts that tell the truth, e.g. the sacred text of the Koran, and those that "lie", such as poetry. Narrative irony, as found in the Western novel, is not a familiar text feature in a culture that expects narrative truth to be identical to real-life truth. Those who use novelistic irony and fiction to criticise Islamic practices, like Salman Rushdie did, are read at face-value and condemned by those who have the authority to be the textual gate-keepers of their culture.

Structural differences are observed even in seemingly monolithic strictly Western scientific writing. Cf.:

> Strategies to approach the main point of scientific writings and structure of scientific publications vary considerably, though one convention of scientific research papers is that they inform researchers of scientific findings as clearly and convincingly as possible, and in a manner that furthers future research. Not every scientific community shares the same views as to how these goals should be achieved. There are striking differences, for example, between the French and the Anglo-Saxon genre "research paper". Anglo-Saxon scientists have to legitimize their research by displaying in the first paragraph all extant research on the same topic and showing how their own fills a neglected gap. By contrast, French scientific articles draw their legitimization from the status and affiliation of the researcher and his/her own work in the field; French scientists find the initial review of the literature rather futile. Unlike their French counterparts, Anglo-Saxon scientists have to make explicit their adherence to a recognizable school, disciplinary tradition, or theoretical orientation; French scientists prefer their research to stand on its own merits, whereas American research articles end with the obligatory discussion of "the limitations of the study", French articles do no such thing; instead, they are obligated to raise larger questions, and point to directions for further

areas of study. These two different styles within two scientific communities that otherwise share the same purpose may create difficulties for some French scientists, who may be willing to publish in English but wish to retain their own cultural scientific style. [Kramsch 1998, p. 63]

Cross-cultural distant communication also includes correspondence and here differences abound. In business correspondence, for example, one should be ready to face great differences between letters written in Western companies and those from Eastern partners. Thus, a Thai letter, written as application to become a dealer of a German producer, had the following peculiarities (besides being extremely voluminous):

> 1. the letter began with a list of all employees and their functions;
> 2. the letter continued with the owner's professional biography;
> 3. the suggestion of becoming a dealer company was mentioned indirectly and in passing;
> 4. the letter mentioned several times relations between the owner and the Thai royal family.

No wonder that Germans, having read the letter, decided that it was a biography sent with the intention to get employed rather than to become a partner.

Cross-cultural distant communication is a challenge because of conventional *style differences* – from subtle to considerable. (Interestingly, the differences in fiction may concern both style and peculiarities of a plot or characters. Thus, some scholars point out that "while English stories tend to center on actions, Japanese stories are much more concerned with the development of characters, motives and relationships between characters" [Kramsch 1998, p. 26].)

The modern approach to communication is based on the assumption that communication is a two-way process: both the speaker and the hearer are active participants in an interaction, since messages are not conveyed and understood automatically but are decoded and interpreted by the hearer. Consequently, *perception of texts* is also culturally specific. Thus, the Arab reader regards a text as a fixed unit in which every-

thing is of equal importance. The text is a plateau rather than a hierarchical structure of statements. Such a perception becomes quite evident if one looks at the physical aspects of the Koran which does not have any paragraphs. So texts are perceived as a linear presentation rather than a composition with a logical order [Osterloh 1998].

A similar approach is typical of Chinese culture. The structure of the text passed on its wisdom not through reading, but through the faithful copying of texts. It was through the rewriting of fixed texts in one's own handwriting that the truths of the ancestors got embodied anew into generations. Copying texts was the major way of getting at the texts' meaning and of obtaining the social prestige that came with a literate education.

Interestingly, the culture of the text and its respect for and obedience to textual authority was also central to the Judaic and early Christian traditions. In these cultures, revelation was to take place through commentary, exegesis, and translation. The implication was that through the study and interpretation of the sacred texts it would be possible to recover the original truths dispensed in oral form by God, angels, and the prophets. The simultaneous desirability and impossibility of that goal have been the subject of many scholars' concern.

> For example, it was the ultimate focus of the Kabbalah, a 12th-century school of Jewish mysticism, named after the Hebrew term for "literary tradition". What Kabbalists looked for in the Bible was not primary philosophical ideas, but a symbolic description of hidden process of divine life. Viewing written language itself as a micro-representation of the universe, Kabbalists built an elaborate system of meanings based on numbers and the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, in an effort to accede to the unwritten secrets of the universe. So, for example, the four letters of the Hebrew name of God, *Yod he vav he* (*Yahweh*), have in Hebrew the numerical value 45 from their position in the alphabet, as does the word "Adam". From this linguistic fact, Kabbalists drew the conclusion that God is in fact Adam. The God who can be apprehended by man is himself, they claimed, the First Man. One can easily see why the Catholic Church condemned the Kabbalah as a heresy. [Kramsch 1998, p. 53—54]

Perception of literary works – and arts in general – is also culture bound. Culture determines what the recipient focuses on while listening or (in case of visual arts) watching. Cf.:

Using the short "pear narrative" film by William Chafe, the researcher Deborah Tannen asked native speakers from Anglo-American and Greek background to retell the film in their own words. Here is how Tannen tells the film: "It showed a man picking pears from a tree, then descending and dumping them into one of three baskets on the ground. A boy comes by on a bicycle and steals a basket of pears. As he's riding away, he passes a girl on a bike, his hat flies off his head, and the bike overturns. Three boys appear and help him gather his pears. They find his hat and return it to him and he gives them pears. The boys then pass the farmer who has just come down from the tree and discovered that his basket of pears is missing. He watches them walk by eating pears". In comparing the narratives told by American women in English and Greek women in Greek, Tannen reports that each group had a distinctive narrative style. The Greeks told "better stories", by often interweaving judgments about the character's behaviour (for example, the boy should not have stolen the pears or should have thanked his helpers sooner), or about the film's message (for example, that it showed a slice of agricultural life, or that little children help each other). In contrast, the Americans reportedly gave a "better recollection" of the original sequence of events, and gave all the details they could remember. They used their judgment to comment on the filmmaker's technique (for example, that the costumes were unconvincing or the soundtrack out of proportion). The Greeks seemed to draw upon an interactive experience which was focused more on interpersonal involvement: telling the story in ways that would interest the interviewer, interpreting the film's human message. The Americans seemed to draw on their willingness to approach a school task for its own demands. They were focusing on the content of the film, treating it as a cinematic object, with critical objectivity. Each group made differential use of orate and literate features according to the expectations their culture had prepared them to have of the task at hand.

It would be dangerous, of course, to generalize this example to all Greeks and all Americans, or to suggest that Greeks in general tell better stories than Americans, since every culture is heterogeneous, i.e. it is composed of a variety of subcultures, and every situation elicits a variety of responses, even within the same culture. The only conclusion one can draw from the examples such as this one is that, given the same situation or piece of art, people from different cultures will interpret it differently. [Kramsch 1998, p. 49—50]

...in order to really understand a Navajo movie one had to be a Navajo Indian who was brought up in the traditional Navajo way of life. Differences between white and Navajo visual perception as applied to movie making occurred at almost every level. For example, editing is a big thing among white cinematographers. We think in bits and try to put the bits together in a coherent whole, so that teaching people to edit film is an important part of their training. Not so the Navajo. They have whole sequences in their heads before they begin shooting, and they edit in their heads as they go along! Navajo rhythms are more integrated than our own — they certainly move that way — which makes it possible for them to experience life (even filming) in a more integrated, holistic manner. We, by contrast, cut things up into little pieces, and it can be tough to live in a fragmented world. [Hall 1989, p. 84]

Perception of fiction, created within foreign cultures, has often drawn scientists' attention. We can find many interesting findings both on the text and on the structural level. In particular, on the text level, there has been registered inability of some peoples to understand *conflict* or *main idea* of a certain text. A classical example is failure, experienced by the ethnologist Bohannan, to explain the main idea of *Hamlet* by Shakespeare to one of the African bush tribes. They perceived the plot through their cultural perspective: Claudius was right to marry his brother's widow, this is actually the only possible behaviour pattern for a good person. The thing he did wrong was to wait for a month: he should have married at once. Hamlet's father's ghost was not understood by thetribe people at all: if a man was dead, how could he go around and speak? Polonius was disapproved: why did he not let his daughter become the chief's son's

lover: it is great honour and, besides, presupposes many expensive gifts. Hamlet killed him in a quite natural way: in the bush, a hunter, hearing some noise, calls out, and if there is no human reply, kills the source of the noise [Bohannan 1991, p.38-39].

Strange as it is, but sometimes writers become more popular in other cultures than in their own. It actually happened to Erich Maria Remarque whose books were read in the USSR with more understanding than in Germany. Interestingly, different cultures choose as favourite his different books: in Germany it is *Im Westen nichts Neues* (*All Quiet on the Western Front*), in Poland – *Arc de Triomphe* (*Arch of Triumph*), in Russia – *Drei Kameraden* (*Three Comrades*).

Köhler-Haering has tried to explain why popularity of *Three Comrades* is so different in Germany and the USSR. The researcher has distinguished the following socio-cultural differences [Köhler –Haering 1994]:

Germany	Former USSR
A rather wary attitude to veterans' organizations, proclaiming indissoluble friendship	Positive attitude to veterans
Consuming "ritually huge" quantity of liquor with simultaneous exchange of philosophical ideas is not typical	Consuming "ritually huge" quantity of liquor with simultaneous exchange of philosophical ideas is quite frequent; Russian women, though do not approve of such behaviour, tolerate it
Pure love between Pat and Robert is perceived, due to the feminist movement, not as taking care of the loved one, but as excessive guardianship and dependence	Robert is seen as ideal man and Pat – as ideal woman
The individual is partially responsible for inability to withstand the environment which includes family and friends	The individual does not feel guilty of own inability to withstand the environment; family and friends are treated as rescue from the rest of the world

In "excessive drinking – philosophical exchange", Germans see relaxation, whereas Russians tend to see plunge into existential fundamentals of being, as well as feeling of true human intimacy. Many Russians do strive for such emotions. Thus, different ideas of "normal" interpersonal relations, status of a woman and attitude to family

and friends make the literary work so close for one culture and quite strange for the other.

All in all, cross-cultural distant communication is extremely challenging for both the sender and the recipient, since cultures differ greatly in status they grant texts with, in differentiation of text types, text structure and style but one of the almost insurmountable difficulties may be different worldviews, reflected in texts. It is actually culture-specific worldviews and values that prevent people of other cultural backgrounds from proper text perception and interpretation.

2. Typologies of Cultures

Differences between cultures formed as a result of evolutionary process constitute the objective basis for CCC. In any culture, life and relations between people are determined by norms that regulate almost all spheres of human thought and behaviour. Education, upbringing, history, traditions, customs and language determine the orientation system that helps people handle everyday situations and problems. Humans are quite often unaware of their cultural norms, since these are part of their personality. Awareness of one's cultural peculiarities starts in contacts with different cultural norms. The clash of norms is frequently imbued with the feeling of discomfort and sometimes gives rise to conflicts.

Yet, behaviour of people from other cultures is not something unpredictable, so the clash may be prevented, provided people take special educational programmes aimed to form knowledge and skills in CCC.

The ambition to understand other cultures, to reveal causes of cultural differences and similarities is just as old as cultural and ethnic diversity of human race itself. As a result, there have appeared several typologies of cultures that consider different problems of cultural interaction. The most famous classifications are the theory of high- and low-context cultures, suggested by Edward T.Hall, the theory of cultural dimensions, whose author is Geert Hofstede, and the theory of cultural literacy, put forward by Eric Donald Hirsh.

2.1. Theory of high- and low-context, mono- and polychronic cultures by Edward T.Hall

Edward Hall was engaged in comparative research of various cultural groups, which helped him not only to distinguish cultural-communicative types, but also to work out a general typology. The typology is based on *context*, interpreted as *information accompanying a certain cultural event*.

Hall noticed that all cultures in interpersonal communication make use of certain unexpressed, hidden rules that are vital for understanding of ongoing events and interpersonal interaction [Hall 1998 a; Hall 1998 b; Hall 1998]. Cultures differ in their "context reading", i.e. in how they use hidden information delivered in every situation. The more context information is necessary to understand a social situation, the higher is complexity of the culture. The higher is the complexity, the more difficult it is for strangers to correctly understand and assess a social situation. These observations became the foundation of Hall's division into **high-context** and **low-context** cultures.

According to Hall's conclusions, the character and results of communication are determined, apart from other factors, by its participants' awareness. The degree of awareness depends, in its turn, on density of a social network and on speed of information exchange between members of the network. According to these criteria, all cultures may be classified into those of **weak** and those of **strong context dependence**. People, who make use of dense informational network, belong to a high-context culture, whereas people with a less intensive information exchange belong to a low-context culture.

High context is an obligatory element of successful understanding of a certain event, since high density of informational networks presupposes tight contacts between family members, constant contacts with friends, colleagues, clients. If it is the case, people maintain close relations. Due to enormous information volume and accumulated historical experience, such cultures may be called **homogeneous**; they are hardly changed by time and by contacts with other peoples. Representatives of high-context cultures react to strange ideas in a similar and predictable way. Hall believes that here usual everyday communication does not

require any detailed information about an ongoing event, since representatives of such cultures are constantly in line with what goes on round them. Countries with high-context cultures are France, Spain, Italy, the Middle East, Japan and Russia.

Representatives of high-context cultures receive a lot of information non-verbally – through hierarchy, status, a person's appearance, manners, living conditions, etc. For example, Japanese, high-context by nature, won't conduct any talks with a company representative, if he/she doesn't hold office high enough, no matter how qualified he/she is.

Cultures of this type make use of various hints, implications, figurative expressions, etc. Thus, if an American gives a positive answer discussing a certain issue, it may not have any other interpretation, whereas a "yes" of a Japanese businessman may not, in fact, mean consent. The matter is that Japanese avoid saying 'no', being afraid of undermining their partner's authority. Japanese are very sensitive to "preserving their partner's face" and will never make him/her feel awkward by rejecting a proposal in public. It should be mentioned that the idea of being careful with partners' face is not strange to other cultures as well, but regard to partners' self-esteem does not always go so far there. For example, if a Finnish businessman intends to reject some proposal, he says *We'll talk about it later*. In Finnish culture, this formula helps to save both the speaker's and the hearer's faces.

Meanwhile, there are low-context cultures that have almost no informal informational networks. These cultures are less homogeneous. People meticulously differentiate their interpersonal relations, i.e. representatives of these cultures do not mix up their personal relations with work and other aspects of everyday life. As a result, these people are less informed and need more additional information in order to understand representatives of other cultures. The low-context cultures are Germany, the USA, Scandinavian and other Northern European states.

In these countries, information is delivered verbally rather than in communication context. Here people often express their wishes explicitly, without expecting to be understood from the situation. These societies pay much attention to words as well as to discussions of details, they prefer open and direct communication, when "a spade is

called a spade". Germans top the list of low-context cultures and are famous for their pedantry. Representatives of the German community value written contracts, papers, treaties, etc.

Comparison of the two types of cultures reveals their specific features. Thus, **high-context cultures** are characterized by

- unexpressed, reserved manner of speech, numerous meaningful pauses;
- great importance of non-verbal communication and tendency to "speak with eyes";
- avoidance of open expression of dissatisfaction under any circumstances.

Low-context cultures, in their turn, are characterized by

- straightforward and expressive manner of speech;
- little importance of non-verbal forms of communication;
- clearly articulated and straightforward evaluation of all topics and issues under discussion;
- interpretation of vague and evasive phrases as the partner's insufficient competence or poor knowledge;
- straightforward expression of discontent.

To illustrate peculiarities of each of the types, one may analyze the work of managers belonging to high- and low-context cultures. In low-context cultures, a manager will see visitors one after another, observing the queue. When at work, he/she won't answer personal phone calls or make personal calls himself/herself. The manager will receive information exclusively from people he/she sees during the day and, also, from his/her papers.

In high-context cultures, on the contrary, a manager's office will be a place, where people circulate constantly during the day. When speaking to visitors, the manager will be distracted by phone calls or other trifles. In this situation, everyone is informed and knows where to look for information.

Besides the problem of context, Hall's theory considers in depth the issue of time in different cultures. Time management is the principal organizing factor of life and communication, since people use time to express their feelings and to emphasize importance of their actions.

Every culture is characterized by its own system of time management, which is vital for CCC. To understand one's partner properly, one should know how time is treated in the partner's culture. According to Hall, time management, taken as a criterion, divides cultures into **polychronic** (i.e. one period of time may be used for several simultaneous activities) and **monochronic** (i.e. time is divided in such a way that one period of time is devoted to only one type of activity).

Monochronic time management presupposes that actions are performed in sequences, one after another during a certain timespan. Consequently, time is seen as linear, leading from past to future. Monochronic time is split into parts, i.e. it is meticulously planned to permit a person to concentrate at a certain moment on one activity only. Representatives of monochronic cultures ascribe material value to time: it may be spent, wasted, saved, spared, caught up with, etc. As a result, it becomes a system which organizes, provides order in human life [Hall E., Hall M. 1983, p.13]. Since a "monochronic person" can cope with one problem at a time, he/she has to "isolate" himself/herself in his/her own world that, so to say, locks up and does not let in other people. Representatives of monochronic cultures don't like being interrupted or disturbed. This type of cultures is typical of Germany, the USA and a number of Northern European countries.

Polychronic time management is opposite to the monochronic one: here, a lot of things happen simultaneously. Polychronic time is understood as a certain tangle of several activities. Therefore, time is less perceptible. In a polychronic culture, personal, human relations play the vital role: communication with a person is appreciated more than a fixed schedule. That is why representatives of polychronic cultures are more dynamic in time management. Punctuality and schedules are not important. Typical polychronic cultures are countries of Latin America, the Middle East, the Mediterranean region and Russia.

Differences between representatives of polychronic and monochronic cultures may be generalized in the following way: in monochronic cultures, people perform one action at a time, they concentrate on and feel responsible for their work, and avoid disturbing others, show more respect to other people, are punctual and usually tend to have short-term interpersonal relations.

> А що, як мені доведеться купувати новий телефон — треба буде економити, чого я не люблю, а потім знову втрачу кілька телефонних номерів, які давала ж собі чесне слово переписати на папір, і так цього не зробила. І потім якось погано звучить, коли ти дзвониш і кажеш: пацани, я знову десь про...ну, як його, прогляділа телефон, ось мій новий номер, просто на випадок, якщо ви в неділю вирішите піти на пікнік, то ось по ньому мені дзвоніть і мене запрошуйте.
>
> Це в Києві проходить на ура. Тут [у Лондоні — І. А.] таке не роблять. Тут я навіть не знаю — з чорта близьким другом треба бути, щоб хтось тобі, або ти комусь, подзвонив і сказав: от щойно подумалось, а давай вийдемо десь погуляємо. У Києві в усіх більше часу, там моя перукарка могла мені подзвонити і сказати — пішли на Сінний погуляємо. І я не казала їй, що у мене всі вікенди розписані на наступні три тижні. Я не казала такої фігні, а ми просто йшли на Сінний, і купували там, наприклад, гобелен з оленями.
>
> Тут хочеш з кимось випити кави — за пару тижнів здзвонись, домовся, і то ще не факт. Усі особисті стосунки у мене були розписані у блокнотику з золоченим тисненням, який мені видали на роботі. [ПСНДПЧ, с. 227]

Representatives of polychronic cultures, vice versa, perform several activities at a time, more often interrupt their work, pay less attention to arrangements but value human relations. They often change their plans, are more interested in private matters, their punctuality depends on relations, they tend to establish relations for a lifetime.

Thus, to a Southern European or a Latin American, the overall impression created by American culture is that of a frantic, perpetual round of actions which leave practically no time for personal feelings and reflection. But, to an American, the reasonable and orderly tempo of French lifestyle conveys a sense of hopeless backwardness and ineffectuality; while the leisurely timelessness of Spanish activities represents an appalling waste of time and human potential. And, to a Spanish speaker, the methodical essence of pre-planned life in France may seem cold-blooded, just as much as his own proclivity toward spur-of-the-moment decisions may strike his/her French counterpart as recklessly irresponsible.

Dividing cultures into high- and low-context, monochronic and polychronic, one should keep in mind that every type presupposes a number of hidden rules and requirements that regulate everyday human lives. In high-context and polychronic cultures, these rules and requirements determine behavioural norms, strictly observed in this society. In Japan, for example, positions at the negotiation table are strictly fixed by seniority. In the Middle East, no negotiation will start without partners exchanging pleasantries and establishing personal relations. Americans' intention to get down to business without wasting time will be treated by representatives of these cultures as impolite and rough.

In low-context cultures, interpersonal relations are often short-term and superficial. People become friends easily and just as easily terminate these relations. The way how easily and quickly Americans get acquainted has given ground to the stereotype that "Americans are very friendly". The other side of the coin is the stereotype that friendship in America is superficial and does not presuppose any loyalty. Indeed, friendly relations in the USA are very specific: they seldom last long. Besides, Americans often range their friendly relations, differentiating between fellow-workers, family friends, friends on vacations, fellow-players, etc.

Thus, Hall's theory helps to get an insight into other culture's rules and understand other cultures' communicative patterns. Yet, within a cultural system we may come across various combinations. Hall's theory only offers description of the most typical features that accompany communication.

William Condon coined the term **entrainment** for the process that occurs when two or more people become engaged in each other's rhythms. In other words, the behaviours of interactants **synchronize.** Our ability to synchronize with our surroundings and others appears to be an inborn and necessary mechanism for survival. We learn early in life to engage with others rhythmically. The pattern we adhere to becomes our cultural rhythm. Because cultural rhythm is so deeply ingrained, it is probably difficult to describe or make clear to others. One manifestation (or outward display) of cultural rhythm is music. Think about music not as something that gives us rhythm, but as a releaser of the rhythms already inside the individual. Listening to the beat of music from a specific culture reveals something about the inherent rhythm of the people of that culture.

In other words, while interacting, individuals create a sense of collective rhythm, called **cultural rhythm**.

Once, on the island of Mykonos, I noticed a group of young people around a table in a sidewalk cafe listening to their portable radio tuned to rock music. Close observation...revealed that they were not consciously listening to the music but were using it instead as a sort of wave with which to synchronize their own movements as a way of heightening or strengthening the group bond.

Even the spoken language can be used for syncing, as I discovered a few years ago while building an office addition to my house. I had hired some of my Spanish American neighbors to do the actual labor and...spent most of my working day with them. Soon several things became apparent. Conversation was continuous. It never stopped. Yet the content was not highly relevant. They were talking to be talking, if the conversation lagged, the work lagged.

What struck me most when working with different cultures in different parts of the world was how everybody moves. If one wanted to fit in, or not appear too conspicuous, it was helpful to begin to move to the local rhythm and conform to the local beat.

In high-context cultures, syncing is very noticeable. It functions on a high level of awareness, and is consciously valued. Perhaps a source of alienation in the members of high-sync, high-context cultures when interacting with low-sync, low-context cultures is the fact that they do not know how to deal with people who are out of phase.

All of this suggests that:

1. The way in which people handle synchrony is both rooted in biology (bio-basis) and modified by culture.

2. Synchrony or lack of it is an index of how things are going and can be an unconscious source of great tension, when synchrony is low, absent, or of the wrong kind.

3. On a practical level, absence or disturbances of synchrony can interfere with work and any group activity — in sports, on production lines, etc.

4. Music and dance, by extension transference, are looked upon as activities that are produced by artists and are inde-

> pendent of the audience. (...) The audience and artist are part of the same process.
>
> ...rhythms and synchrony of the type I have been describing are classed as having little meaning in the West. However, this could simply be because Western cultures are relatively low-context. For high-context, highly involved cultures, rhythm does have meaning. [Hall 1989, p. 78—79]

The table below illustrates how differently time may be perceived across cultures:

Perception of time	Interpretation	Example
as a location	"When" something happens, a specific point in time	In Finland, dinner is at 5pm, in Spain commonly at 9pm
as a duration	"How long" something lasts, includes a start and a finish	In Finland, dinner lasts perhaps 30mins, in Spain 60-90mins.
as an interval	A chain of events, that is time spans with a start and a finish linked together; the more we divide up our time, the greater the sense of feeling "busy"	Mealtimes give intervals to our day, that is, times of eating and not eating.

[from Gore 2007, p. 73]

By making the communicative behaviour visual in relation to time orientation, we can notice some interesting phenomena. The single path of communication characteristic of a monochronic time orientation leads to a **compartmentalization** of information, that is, information is known only between the two interacting individuals or groups of individuals. Furthermore, analyzed spatially, the space in which the people communicate is compartmentalized, which makes access to information more difficult, especially when the information is contained within an enclosed space such as a room with a closed door. People in low context monochronic cultures (e.g., northern European cultures) tend to form communication networks in the form of the chain or circle. The outcome of these networks is that the flow of information is slowed down. However, in its favour, there

appears to be higher individual satisfaction because each member in the link has a degree of influence on the content of information.

On the contrary, high context polychronic communication tends to develop towards **centralization**. Among a group of people interacting, one person tends to stand out among the others as a kind of "leader" or at least most informed or best linked to others. Information flows between all individuals, even if a message is directed to one person in particular, other people present take part by actively listening. In other words, information tends to naturally flow in centralized networks in the wheel formation. When assessing this network for performance (i.e. how information flows), it is fast, but there tends to be a high rate of error in information, perhaps because the information travels through an intermediary who might consciously or unconsciously alter the information and might select more, less or no input from all contributing members. All seemingly minor details present in the space become valuable information. Coincidentally, attention to non-verbal behaviour tends to be higher among polychronic people. They are not only used to more variety of communication styles, but also the ability to discern information from such behaviours is of utmost importance in understanding the dynamic of collective communication.

It is probably due to this reasoning that office spaces in characteristically monochronic cultures are trying to incorporate an open-plan office space to facilitate a more centralized, polychronic flow of information within the organization. However, deeply rooted communication patterns are slow to change; partitions are quickly erected to create a sense of compartmentalized space and complaints about lack of privacy are frequent. In highly polychronic cultures, such as southern Italy a reverse phenomenon occurs. Although shops along a narrow street are in themselves small compartments of space, whenever there is a break between serving customers, shopkeepers converge on the street to talk, thus the street is the open space to centralize communication once again. Similarly, the deeply rooted polychronic behaviour finds its place despite the spatial limitations.

Within Europe, two time orientations clash: monochronic culture confronts polychronic culture at the French-German border. The French and Germans are aware of each other's time and task regulating

preferences. It is as if time orientation forms the border between the two cultures more effectively than any physical boundary ever could. A degree of mixing has hypothetically occurred because the French are more monochronic than say the Spanish. The French are monochronic intellectually (logic and reason are highly valued in French education) but polychronic in behaviour. [Gore 2007, p. 75–77]

2.2. Theory of cultural dimensions by Geert Hofstede

Every person is influenced by individual psychic peculiarities, by social surrounding and specific features of ethnic culture, which leads to formation of a certain worldview, mindset, perception, etc. The vast majority of social models is formed in childhood, since it is the age when a person is most perceptible to learning. Certain feelings, thought forms and actions that take place in childhood and get fixed in human consciousness, are stored and can hardly be changed later on, since a person needs to renounce old patterns in order to acquire new ones. To renounce usual emotions, ideas and behaviour patterns appears much more difficult than to learn something from scratch.

Formation of emotions, thoughts and behaviour results in so-called mental programmes that may be studied by means of cultural dimensions drawn along the following parameters:

- power distance (from small to large),
- collectivism – individualism,
- masculinity – femininity,
- uncertainty avoidance (from strong to weak).

These ideas are the starting point in the culture theory proposed by the Dutch sociologist Geert Hofstede, who was one of the first in sociology of culture to use considerable statistic data to analyze cultural values [Hofstede 1991; Hofstede 1993]. The theory of cultural dimensions is based on the results of written questionnaires, filled in by 116 000 employees of the IBM company in over 60 countries during the 15-year period (with the exception of the former socialist states). Hofstede argues that different phenomena of cultures may be measured along the parameters given above. The parameters combine with each other in various ways, which determines mentality of a certain culture.

The dimension "**power distance**" means comparing cultures according to power concentration and power distribution on different levels of organization. This indicator helps to establish how important various cultures see hierarchical relations between people. Power distance measures unequal power distribution in society and a society's readiness to accept this inequality. Power distance is explained by Hofstede with the help of principal values, shared by people in power.

In cultures with great power distance, power is seen as something given, having fundamental foundation. Therefore representatives of these cultures believe that power is the most important part of social life, while those in power treat their subordinates as drastically different from themselves. These cultures, as a rule, emphasize the coercive nature of power. Such a society appreciates responsibility, industriousness, conformity, rigid and authoritarian government.

The issue of power legitimacy is not that important, since the society is deeply convinced that the world is based on inequality and that's the way it should be. The matter is that some cultures have predominantly hierarchical (vertical) structural organization, while other cultures do not have a so pronounced hierarchy. In hierarchical societies ranking high in power distance, subordinates are prepared for unequal authority distribution and therefore obey all the top officials: bosses (no matter whether they are business bosses or top state officials) are traditionally respected and obeyed. These cultures do not allow any objections, strong criticism or open resistance.

The obedience and submission stem from the general conviction that people are unequal from the very birth, that everyone has one's own place, given according to a complicated hierarchical social structure, and that there is a definite distance between social strata. At school, children are taught not to interrupt their teacher or ask questions, since it is interpreted as disrespect for seniors. In these cultures, power is usually centralized, many people are engaged in control and supervision.

Another peculiarity of cultures, cultivating power distance, is bureaucracy and "patronage system". Thus, in Mediterranean Europe, for example, people's reputations are in part measured by their ability to "fix" things, or to know the appropriate "fixers" (people of higher status such as doctors or school teachers) who can deal on their be-

half with channels of bureaucracy, or pull strings. The patronage system in a French village in the Hautes Alps may be associated, for example, with the role of the former village secretary to the Mayor who sorts pensions. In exchange, people offer her deference, accompany her to church or choir practice, or patronize her nephew's grocery shop [Barro, Jordan, Roberts 1998, p.87]. The extreme case of a patronage system is corruption.

In cultures with low power distance, people believe that inequality should be reduced as much as possible. They think that hierarchy implies inequality and value such qualities as equality, individual freedom and respect for personality. Here, subordinates regard themselves as equal to bosses. Communication in such cultures is less formal, equality of communicators is expressed more pronouncedly, communication style resembles consultation rather than "order - obedience". Cf.:

> В Англии люди управляются или самоуправляются на месте и от высших властей зависят в гораздо меньшей степени, чем у нас в стране. Распределение в Англии идет так, как у нас когда-то было, сто там с лишним лет тому назад. Что производится, то и потребляется. Потому общество роздроблено на буквально атомарные частицы, и человеку, привыкшему к тому, что все идет по иерархической лестнице сверху, никак к этому не привыкнуть. У меня есть приятель, оперный критик, он мне говорит: "Сева, я до сих пор жду звонка из райкома, чтоб мне сказали, что мне делать". [АММЗЖ, с. 141−142]

Cultures with low power distance suggest inconsiderable emotional distance between bosses and subordinates. For example, an employee may always approach his/her boss with a question or express a critical remark. Open disagreement or active resistance to the boss is also normal. Vice versa, cultures with high power distance presuppose strong dependence between bosses and subordinates: employees should recognize their boss' power or terminate any relationships. Here, the emotional distance between bosses and employees is very big. Employees can hardly ask a question, not to say anything critical. According to Hofstede's data, Turkish culture presupposes high power distance, while Germans maintain low power distance.

If we compare Western cultures and Ukraine, then we will see that Western business culture is characterized by glass doors, free entrance in the boss' room, and mutual respect. Contrary to Western business etiquette and structure, Ukrainians stick to two or three hierarchical levels of power with many orders from bosses to their subordinates, which makes distance between them bigger and complicates handling problems.

The **"individualism - collectivism"** dimension shows the degree to which a culture encourages social bonds in comparison with individual independence and reliance on one's own self. Suggesting this parameter, Hofstede believed that, according to the priority given to a person's or society's needs, all cultures could be divided into collectivist and individualist.

A culture is individualist if its members' individual goals are more important than goals of their group. Individualism is peculiar of cultures with loose social structure where everyone has to take care of themselves and their families.

A collectivist culture is, on the contrary, characterized by group dominance over an individual. Collectivism is typical of societies with a rigid social structure, distinct division into social groups inside which each individual is guaranteed care and attention in exchange for unconditioned loyalty to the group. According to Hofstede, the vast majority of people live in collectivist societies whose interests prevail over the interests of a person. Collectivist nature of a society implies group power over a person. This type of cultures is characteristic of the majority of traditional Asian and African societies as well as Catholic countries in Southern Europe and Latin America, where much attention is paid to family and community relations and values.

In the majority of collectivist societies, a family consists of quite a great number of people living under one roof. It includes not only parents and children but also grandparents, uncles, aunts and other relatives. These people become the first and principal guides of a person. If children were brought up in such families, they, from the very beginning, perceive themselves as a part of the "we-group". Every big family distinguishes itself from other groups in the society and creates its own identity. Thus, an individual develops depend-

ence on the group. His/her group protects him/her throughout life but asks for loyalty in return.

For example, Japanese, besides the modern legal system, also follow unwritten law of social behaviour which presupposes strict subordination that reminds an individual of his/her place and requires to constantly observe a certain distance in relationships. Awareness of one's belonging to a certain group, readiness to consider group loyalty prior to personal interests – this all makes Japanese isolated and reserved. Friendly relations between people of different age and status are extremely rare. The circle of friends is very limited. Apart from relatives and former schoolmates, these are, as a rule, fellow-workers of the same rank. Since every group in the Japanese society is based on hierarchy, then anyone who tries to get into it from the outside is immediately a stranger in the system of strong relations established long ago.

In collectivist cultures, people perceive the world and form their attitude to it from the group perspective. Collectivism is characterized by rigid social structure which divides into "insiders" and "outsiders". Attention is paid to opinions, goals, needs of a group rather than those of an individual. Social norms and duties are determined by the group. The importance of a person depends not on personal qualities but on his/her place in the social hierarchy. The culture stresses everyone's belonging to organization. In such societies, there is no personal opinion as such. "Personal opinion" is determined by the group's opinion, and if there arises a problem group attitude to which is not defined, the council of the group works out an opinion.

Here is an abstract from an interview of the Japanese artist Mariko Mori, who, being quite young, left Japan for London and then moved to New York: "Первое, что мне бросилось в глаза в Лондоне, - западный индивидуализм. Когда я училась там, заметила, что многие студенты оставили свои семьи, жили одни, сами принимали решения. Причем семьи необязательно содержали их, то есть молодые люди были полностью независимы. Это прямо противоположно Японии. (...) В японском обществе тебе говорят, кто ты, с ранних лет. (...) Я думаю, необходимо самому соз-

> дать свою индивидуальность и понять, кто ты, самому идентифицировать себя. Это очень важно. Это то, чему я выучилась на Западе. [ДИБ, с. 80]"

Compare also a personal experience of a Chinese student, Fan Shen, learning English writing. Fan Shen describes how, in order to write acceptable English in a composition class at a US university, she had to "reconcile (her) Chinese identity with an English identity dictated by the rules of English composition". Her Chinese identity emphasized "we", her English identity emphasized "I":

> "Rule number one in English composition is: Be yourself. (More than one composition instructor has told me, "Just write what you think.") The values behind this rule, it seems to me, are based on the principle of protecting and promoting individuality (private property) in this country. The instruction was probably crystal clear to students raised on these values, but as a guideline of composition, it was not very clear or useful to me when I first heard it. First of all, the image or meaning that I attached to the word "I" or "myself" was, as I found out, different from that of my English teacher. In China, "I" is always subordinated to "we" — be it the working class, the Party, the country, or some other collective body. Both political pressure and literary tradition require that "I" be somewhat hidden or buried in writings — and speeches, presenting the "self" too obviously would give people the impression of being disrespectful of the Communist party in political writings and boastful in scholarly writings.
>
> Now, in America, I had to learn to accept the words "I" and "self" as something glorious (as Whitman did), or at least something not to be ashamed of or embarrassed about. It was the first and probably biggest step I took in English composition and critical writing."

The minority of people live in societies where individual interests prevail over group interests. These societies and groups were called by Hofstede *individualist*. Here, relations between people depend on people's individual interests and ambitions. In such societies, the

choice of clothes, friends, an occupation or a spouse is relatively free from one's family or anyone else. It does not mean that people are not influenced by others. But the degree of the influence is by far more inconsiderable than in collectivist societies.

Respectively, in individualist societies of Germany, the USA, Australia, Great Britain, Canada, the Netherlands, and New Zealand, relations between people are less important. It is believed that every person in these cultures should take care of himself/herself and his/her family. Achieving one's goals is here more important than any personal relations. An individual's loyalty to the group is low, everyone belongs to several groups, passing from one to another when the need arises. These cultures appreciate competition rather than cooperation. Private property, personal opinions are highly valued as well as the ability to take independent decisions. Cf.:

> Посмотрите на английскую архитектуру, вы все поймёте. Приватность во всем. Маленькое, дешевенькое, если средства позволяют, но лучше, конечно, на пятнадцати акрах с собственным озером и подъездом — но только свое. Чтоб ни с кем не нужно было жить вместе. Совершенно антикоммунальная культура. Посмотрите на русского: община, сходка, соборность, вече, колхоз и т.д. Мы привыкли жить коллективом. За счет этого у нас и чувство локтя и чувство юмора другие. Англичане в принципе друг другу не доверяют, чтоб стать приятелем англичанину, нужно очень много лет. С другой стороны, они очень терпимы, они обожают экзотику, тогда как русские в массе ненавидят чужака. В Лондоне чувствуешь себя гражданином мира. [АММЗЖ, с. 151—152]

Every type of culture has its advantages and disadvantages. Collectivists have to stick to numerous economic, social and cultural restrictions getting reliable support in exchange. Individualists achieve prosperity and have a wider choice in their lifestyle and behaviour.

Putting forward the **masculinity – femininity** dimension, Hofstede underlines that it does not only concern the expected gender roles but also marks dominance of feminine or masculine traits in national character (as understood in most Western cultures). So called masculine

cultures value competitiveness, assertiveness, ambition, and the accumulation of wealth and material possessions, whereas feminine cultures place more value on relationships and quality of life. (Because of the taboo on sexuality in many cultures, particularly masculine ones, and because of the obvious gender generalizations implied by Hofstede's terminology, this dimension is often renamed by users of Hofstede's work, e.g. to *Quantity of life vs. Quality of Life*.)

In masculine cultures, respectively, persistence, strength, independence, material success, and openness dominate. These are Austria, Great Britain, Venezuela, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Switzerland, the Philippines, Japan. Here gender roles are distinct: boys are taught to be resolute and persistent, while girls should be caring and yielding. At work, people appreciate most of all results and rewards are given according to the real contribution into the result.

Feminine cultures are Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Finland, Chile, Sweden where emotional relations between people are highly alued as well as care for other society members. Men in these cultures should not be persistent, they should take part in their children's upbringing. Correspondingly, children are encouraged to be modest and develop solidarity. Representatives of these cultures promote social gender equality and compassion with failures. Conflicts are settled by means of negotiations and compromise. Rewards are granted predominantly according to the principle of equality.

Dominance of the feminine or the masculine in a certain culture influences communication: masculine societies encourage the aggressive communication style, since competition is more important than cooperation. In masculine cultures, people are more motivated to achieve practical results, they see sense of life in their work; recognition, success and competition are treated as main sources of satisfaction. The communication style of feminine cultures is considerably different: the emphasis here is laid on people's mutual dependence and care of each other.

The **uncertainty avoidance** dimension means comparing cultures along the line of acceptable deviations from established norms and values. Avoidance of uncertainty is a measure of ambiguity tolerance within a society, i.e. whether people see danger or threat in a new,

strange, unexpected situation. Avoidance presupposes shunning people whose personality is seen as imaginary or immediate danger.

In fact, the state and feeling of uncertainty is an irrevocable part of human existence, since humans are unable to predict events neither in the nearest nor remote future. By means of various technologies, laws or religions, people have always tried to lower the level of uncertainty in their life. Strategies to reduce uncertainty differ across cultures and depend on the importance ascribed to uncertainty in a culture. Thus, Hofstede divides cultures into two types – with high and low level of uncertainty avoidance.

In cultures that score high in uncertainty avoidance, people become stressed and feel fear in uncertain situations. High level of uncertainty sets free much energy. Therefore people from such cultures tend to become aggressive and create special channels to let the aggression out.

Representatives of cultures with strong fear for uncertainty invent many formal rules, reject any deviations in behaviour, believe in the absolute truth. They are intolerant to people with other behaviour patterns, they resist any changes, painfully take ambiguity, are concerned with future, and prefer not to risk. Their behaviour is based on agreement. They are much preoccupied with the security issues and feel strong need of written rules, instructions and laws that make their life stable and regulated. People of these cultures are inclined to set definite goals, detailed tasks, rigid schedules and road maps. These are Belgium, Germany, Guatemala, Greece, Peru, Portugal, Uruguay, France and Japan.

In cultures with low level of uncertainty avoidance, people are not afraid to risk in unfamiliar situations, therefore they are less affected by fear and are less stressed. Naturally, being less afraid of uncertainty, people resist excessive regulation or orderliness of life, copious rules and instructions. They tend to set rules only for emergency cases. They feel quite at ease in extraordinary situations that open up possibilities for creative solutions of a problem. These peoples are convinced that there should be fewer rules and one should rely only on oneself. Representatives of these cultures bear unpredictable twists of life better, they are not shocked by incomprehensible actions or new ideas, they are tolerant to everything unusual, highly

appreciate initiative, readiness to take chances. These qualities are typical of Denmark, India, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, the USA, Finland and Sweden.

We may notice here an interesting correlation of the dimensions. Thus, a high score on the dimension of power distance correlates significantly with a high score on the dimension of uncertainty avoidance. Southern European countries are said to favour clear power structures, a fair amount of collectivism and masculinity and to prefer to avoid uncertainty. Northern European countries in many respects seem to be the exact opposite. Status does not automatically carry privileges; men and women have equal rights; and individual initiative is generally appreciated. These countries mainly score low on the dimension of uncertainty avoidance and around average on the collective – individualist dimension. Hofstede notes that the borderline between northern and southern cultural differences coincides with the frontiers achieved by the Roman Empire, and particularly in Western Europe with the dividing line between a southern part which mainly supports the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant north.

Michael Harris Bond and his collaborators subsequently found a fifth dimension which was initially called **Confucian dynamism**. Hofstede later incorporated this into his framework as **long vs. short term orientation**. It describes a society's "time horizon", or the importance attached to the future versus the past and present. In long term oriented societies, values include persistence, ordering relationships by status, thrift, and having a sense of shame; in short term oriented societies, values include normative statements, personal steadiness and stability, protecting one's face, respect for tradition, and reciprocation of greetings, favours, and gifts. China, Japan and the Asian countries score especially high (long-term) here, with Western nations scoring rather low (short-term) and many of the less developed nations very low; China scored highest and Pakistan lowest. It should be noted, however, that some Asian societies are rapidly changing, with individual members adopting a "get-rich-quickly mentality".

It should be mentioned that Hofstede's theory of cultural dimensions has been criticized from different angles. First of all, for its limited character. Each culture presents its members with a programme for actions different from programmes in other cultures.

Therefore, they are not restricted only to the four dimensions. At the same time, the parameters considerably simplify understanding of cultural differences, which helps to predict and be flexible with partners in CCC and avoid potential cultural conflicts. Also, these cultural differences describe averages or tendencies and not characteristics of individuals. A Japanese person for example can have a very low "uncertainty avoidance" compared to a Filipino even though their "national" cultures point strongly in different direction. Consequently, a country's scores should not be interpreted as deterministic.

2.3. Alternative dimensions of cultural differences

Cultural differences can certainly be traced along many criteria. For example, cultures differ in terms of people's striving for perfection and professionalism. Thus, we may distinguish between "specialist" and "generalist" cultures. The best example of the latter is probably Russia (like, perhaps, any other former Soviet republic), where the average man has almost all building skills and can repair almost anything: a car, plumbing, electrical appliances, etc. Cf.:

> Народ наш изобретательный, очень импровизационный, вырос по методу холодного воспитания телят: куда не пойдешь — везде теплее. И публика наша образованная, особенно которая образованная. У нас ведь нет классического образования, зато есть техническое, и очень все соображают в электричестве, что вызывает в Англии огромный восторг. [АММЗЖ, с. 152]

The majority of Western European states and the USA are specialist. Here, the specialist tradition started to form in the Middle Ages and reached its peak in the post-industrial society. Cf.:

> ...если американец заостривает только кончики, так он знает это дело лучше всех на свете, но он может никогда ничего не слыхать про иголыи ушки. Иголыи ушки — не его специальность, и он не обязан их знать. [МВОА, с. 26]

Another of possible alternative approaches to culture classification may be based on dimensions first proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodbeck in 1961 on cultural value orientations. The scholars put forward six values:

- perception of the individual: What do members of a society assume about the nature of people, that is, are people good, bad or a combination?
- relationship to nature and the world: What do the members of a society assume about the relationship between a person and nature, that is, should we live in harmony with or subjugate nature?
- relationship to other people: What do the members of a society assume about the relationship between people, that is, should a person act in an individual manner or consider the group before taking action (individualism to groupism or collectivism in terms of such issues as making decisions, conformity, etc.)?
- primary type of activity: What is the primary mode of activity in a given society? Is it "being", or accepting the status quo, enjoying the surrent situation, and going with the flow of things; or "doing", or changing things to make them better, setting specific goals, accomplishing them within specific schedules, and so forth?
- orientation to time: What is the society's dominant time orientation: past, present or future?
- orientation to space: What is the conception of space in a given society, that is, is it considered private in that meetings are held in private, people do not get too close to one another physically, and so on; or public, that is, having everyone participating in meetings and decision making, allowing emotions to be expressed publicly, and having people stand in close proximity to one another?

Here is how Finnish cultural values orientation looks like in terms of this model:

"The Finnish attitude toward people's qualities as individuals is that people are *inherently* good. Even people who

commit the worst crimes are not condemned to a lifelong jail sentence and capital punishment does not exist. In other words, the legal system reflects the belief that people are basically "good". In their orientation to nature and the world, Finns seek *harmony* between modern technology and preserving nature, which is evidenced by their conscious commitment to develop industries that continually reduce the strain on the environment. Although reaching group consensus is common and appreciated in Finland, perhaps the basic orientation to human relations is more geared to the individual. At the very least, people wish to be respected and appreciated for *individual* achievements, but not at the expense of group harmony. Therefore, individual achievement is often expressed in modest terms.

When it comes to the culturally preferred type of activity, Finns are clearly *doing-oriented*. The past is not forgotten, especially the impact of WWII, but overall a Finn thinks more about what he/she will be doing tomorrow than simply feeling content with today, thus there is a strong *future-orientation*. Outsiders would probably categorize Finns as highly private individuals, which they often are, but with regard to their orientation to space, they are both private and public. A good example is the summer cottage or *mųkki*. Many Finnish families own a cottage, and more often than not, it is isolated in the forest and near to a lake. However, the land which it is on is not fenced nor are there any boundary markers. Additionally, the "Everyman's right" or *jokamie-henoikeus* entitles all Finns to enter the land of others to pick berries and mushrooms as long as the trespasser stays within a reasonable distance of the cottage or other inhabited structure." [Gore 2007, p. 42—43]

Perception of nature. There may be three different types of viewing nature:

- nature as controlled by a human;
- harmony between a human and nature;
- nature as restriction to a human.

Depending on the attitude to nature, people's views range from free expression of will to fatalism. For instance, the first variant dominates in industrial countries, where a human dominates nature. Human behaviour in such cultures is based on the conviction that human is omnipotent, all human desires can be fulfilled if an effort is made.

In case of harmonious relations between a human and nature, there is no difference between human life and nature, all actions and activities are agreed with nature. This perception is typical of Japanese and Chinese cultures.

In case of subordination of humans to nature, people are fatalists. In such cultures, people see any events as inevitable, and human behaviour is determined by these events. Representatives of these cultures seldom promise anything, but if their plans are wrecked, it is treated as unavoidable, impossible to control. Cf.:

> Почуття глибокого задоволення написано на обличчях всіх без винятку жителів цього регіону [*арабських країн*]. Швидше за все, справа тут у фаталізмі, яким просякле вчення пророка Мухамеда. Якщо символом російської культури став знаменитий "авось", то повноправним дзеркалом арабського життя є вираз "інша-алла" ("якщо на те буде воля Аллаха"). Без цієї фрази немає жодної розмови, нею закінчують ділові перемовини, з нею призначають побачення, живуть та працюють. [3, с. 11]

Perception of time. Time is viewed and valued differently with different peoples. This has been noticed by Carl Jung in 1920, when he was invited to accompany a friend on a trip to the North African areas of Algiers, Tunisia, Sousse, and on into Sahara. It was on this trip that Jung wrote of experiencing an alteration in the sense of time, becoming acutely aware of the importance Europeans attach to watches (especially Swiss watches) and all things mechanical, to the point of forgetting the more natural ways. Here is what he wrote:

> The deeper we penetrated into the Sahara, the more time slowed down for me; it even threatened to move backward... As we approached the oasis, a single rider, wholly swathed in white came toward us. With proud bearing he rode by without offering us any greeting, mounted on a black mule whose harness was banded and studded with silver. He made an impressive, elegant figure. Here was a man who certainly possessed no pocket watch, let alone a wrist watch; for he was obviously and self-consciously the person he had always been. He lacked that faint note of foolishness which clings to the European. The European is, to be sure, convinced that he is no longer what he was ages ago; but he does not know what he has since become.

Each culture has its own language of time that should be learned. Thus, if Western cultures measure time accurately and treat being late as fault, Arabs, Latin Americans and peoples from some Asian cultures are not at all surprised by somebody's unpunctuality. Thus, a practical example of different perception of time may be attitude of people to punctuality. In most Northern European countries, people value punctuality. For instance, in Germany, Switzerland and as well as in North America, people expect their partners to arrive on time. There is a certain "scale" of lateness, and each mark on the scale corresponds to a relevant excuse. Thus, business etiquette permits to be no more than 7 minutes late for a business meeting. Keeping your partner waiting means your light-mindedness and loss of your partner's trust. Students waiting for a teacher 15 minutes have the right to leave.

In Latin America, on the contrary, it is normal to be 45 minutes late. In Columbia, according to some data, one can be late for an hour and a half. Compare also:

> ...эта праздная русская жизнь... так непривычна. В Америке каждую потерянную минуту ощущаешь как потерянную каплю крови, как потерю новых возможностей. [АМВНД, с. 129]
>
> Позвонив Герде и узнав, что сегодня у нее вечеринка, я томно предположила: "Может быть, заеду". Уцепилась за приятеля, с его помощью купила билет "хин унд цурюк",

ухватила на дорогу хавку в виде грозди бананов и броси-
лась на платформу, на которой заранее фланировали толь-
ко представители третьего мира. Только представители
третьего мира психологически не вписывались в контекст
европейского транспорта, относящегося к единству места и
времени как классический театр, то есть "в двенадцать" оз-
начает в двенадцать поезд будет стоять на платформе, а не
подъезжать или отъезжать от нее. [АМВНД, с. 241]

Perception of space. First of all, it should be noted that percep-
tion of distances is remarkably culturally specific. For example, for
US citizens, the 200 km distance does not seem a frighteningly long
drive, whereas for Europeans it is quite far. This phenomenon is
called *space penetrability*. Obviously, these peculiarities result from
geographic characteristics of the territory. (Much also depends on a
lifestyle and mobility. The average American, for example, moves
house every five years, the average European – every 10 years,
whereas in the former Soviet republics people change their place of
residence every 45 years.)

Still, talking about space, scholars mainly mean so-called *per-
sonal space,* i.e. room necessary for an individual to feel comfortable
and secure. Size of the space depends on the degree of intimacy be-
tween people, conventional for a culture or an activity. Personal
space is very important, since intrusion is usually viewed as attempt
at one's inner world.

Communicative distance may turn into a problem, since wrong
distancing may be misinterpreted by representatives of different cul-
tures. The matter is that most people feel space not only visually but
by means of all senses. From the very childhood, one learns mean-
ings of special signals and distinguishes them correctly within the
framework of one's culture. Communicating with other cultures,
one's senses are unable to interpret unfamiliar special signs, which
may lead to misunderstanding and conflict.

According to the space parameter, cultures are divided into those
with either dominant *public* or dominant *personal space*.

The first type is characterized by a small distance between indi-
viduals in communication, by frequent touches to each other, living

in one room, absence of personal offices at work. Representatives of such cultures do not hesitate to rummage through other people's personal things, drop in without an invitation, etc.

Cultures with dominant personal space treat as normal touches from close people or other people during certain rituals. Communicative distance should be no less than arm's length. Family members tend to have their own rooms, all employees work in separate offices, reading other people's correspondence is considered a very arrogant intrusion, visits are agreed upon in advance.

Therefore people's reaction to the same signals almost always differ across cultures. In countries with little attention to personal space, crowds where people touch each other and even push each other are quite normal. These cultures are typical of Italy, Spain, France, Russia, the Middle East etc. In other cultures, e.g. Germany, the USA, Northern European countries, on the contrary, people do their best to avoid close distance and touching.

Gestures and personal space in conversation are an irrevocable part of communication. Distance between strangers in conversation shows communication dynamics revealed by gestures. If a communicator comes very closely, we automatically take a step back. Thus, a Latin American and a European normally speak at different distances. Communicating with each other, the Latin American will try to get at the customary distance, whereas the European will take it as invasion of his personal space. The European will try to move backwards. In response, the Latin American will try to get closer again, which will be seen by the European as aggression.

Perception of human nature. This criterion is based on the peculiarities of human character and human's attitude to conventional norms and other people. There are cultures that believe a human to be a primordial sinner. These cultures distinguish very meticulously between the good and the evil. These notions are very important, since they are the basis of the principal cultural values.

The opposing type is made up by cultures where human nature is believed to be primordially good, and since a human is positive, the notions of good and evil are relative and depend on circumstances. Behavioural norms and law should be applied in a flexible way and their violation may also give good results.

2.4. Cultural literacy by Eric Donald Hirsh

The necessary element of effective CCC is a sufficient level of cultural literacy that presupposes understanding of background knowledge, value systems, psychological and social identity, typical of a culture. The notion of cultural literacy was elaborated by the American culture scientist Eric Donald Hirsh [Hirsh 1988; Hirsh et al. 1993].

The main goal of the theory is that one should develop necessary skills and knowledge in order to communicate with people of other cultures. According to Hirsh, to be successful in CCC, one needs to master not only a foreign language but also to be aware of cultural symbols. This knowledge covers language meanings, communicative peculiarities, meaning of texts and discourse, peculiar to a culture.

Hirsh writes about cultural literacy as phenomenon that is called upon to create "a spirit of communal cooperation". It includes necessary knowledge that permits the speaker to read his/her native newspaper and understand explicit and implicit information in articles, i.e. to correlate context with sense. Cultural literacy makes us masters of a standard cognitive and communicative instrument, thus it helps us to pass and receive complex oral and written information in time and space [Hirsh 1988, p. 2-3]. It is important to bear in mind that cultural literacy does not consist of culture-specific information alone but of information about the world as a whole. Cultural literacy is the most dynamic component of CCC, it requires adding more and more current cultural information.

Cultural literacy consists of communicators' competencies of various types: linguistic, cultural, communicative. Hirsh distinguishes between the following levels of CC competence:

- level necessary for survival;
- level sufficient for entering a foreign culture;
- level providing full-value existence in a new culture, i.e. its 'appropriation';
- level permitting to realize fully the identity of a language personality.

To adequately understand CCC and to effectively interact, one needs to develop proportionate correlation between the levels of linguistic, communicative and cultural competencies. In case of asymmetry, a person who has mastered a language is expected to have a corresponding level of cultural competence and is treated as if he/she had mastered a sufficient bulk of cultural information.

Reading and assignments

1. *Read the abstract from the book by W.De Jong* Open Frontiers. Teaching English in an Intercultural Context*:*

…there are four types of parental behaviour towards children (…).

Parents of type one leave their children to their own devices. As long as the child does not bother them with irrelevancies life is happy. Intrusions into the parents' peace and quiet are mostly not accepted: the child is left to fend for itself, until an emergency makes the parents' attention unavoidable. Doing things together happens only rarely in this type of family.

A second group of parents are like the first in that they do not spend too much time with their children. The main difference, however, is that these parents wish their children to become independent, autonomous, to achieve something useful in their lives. They start things together but very soon leave the child to fend for itself, while they do their own things.

The traditional parents are the third group. They generally impose a code of behaviour derived from outside authority. This is mostly their religion, of whatever denomination. The child is firmly drilled to behave according to the teachings of this authority, and no misbehaviour is accepted. Sometimes the ultimate authority is Dad, and not some vague outside personality. Sometimes mother may stand in for the father, but any difficult decision will be referred to him and decided by him alone.

The final group, and the largest apparently in the Netherlands, form a happy blend of traditional and innovative approaches to parenthood. These parents are happy to guide the child towards autono-

mous behaviour while holding on to traditional family values. They will discuss decisions and explain them to their children. They will help the children to make up their own minds if possible. When necessary they will decide for them, but the decision is always negotiable. [De Jong 1996, p. 72–73]

• *Name cultures associated to each of the parenting types and place them on Hofstede's four-dimension scale, i.e. decide whether a certain type scores high or low in power distance, uncertainty avoidance etc.*
• *Do you believe the types above result only from cultural peculiarities? Are there any other factors that influence upbringing patterns?*

2. *Here are several abstracts from the book by Manuela Gretkowska "The European" ("Європейка"). In the first two abstracts, the Polish author, who lived for several years in Sweden, compares Polish and Swedish societies. In the third and the fourth, she describes her experience from a trip to Japan. With the help of the abstracts, try to analyze Swedish, Polish and Japanese cultures in terms of Hofstede's theory of cultural dimensions.*

У Швеції, поки жінка наважиться на переривання вагітності, вона проходить психологічні тести, розмови з працівниками громадської опіки. Ймовірна операція трактується як особиста трагедія, в якій жінку слід підтримати. З'ясовується, чи вона справді не має умов для народження, пропонують усиновлення.

У нашій країні завдяки закону проти аборту дають хабар платним убивцям, бо аборт, згідно з переконанням святенників, є вбивством дитини атеїстичною мафією. [ГМЄ, с. 105]

Відкриття можливостей жіночого підвиду, нездатного досі, якщо не зважати на деякі винятки, займатися політикою. З таким самим успіхом можна було б розмірковувати, чи можуть займатися політикою гомосексуалісти. Ніхто не цікавиться компетенцією – лише статтю. Те, що у Швеції (де половина уряду - жінки) вважали б образою, тут сприймають як милу дискусію, чоловіче кокетство.

У Польщі чоловік при владі не почуває себе компетентним, бо він, як правило, таким не є. Він просто переконаний, що набагато кращий за будь-кого іншого, а в суспільній свідомості він кращий від усіх жінок без винятку. [ГМЄ, с. 205–206]

Cf. В ліричних українських піснях ми бачимо широку свободу дівочої й жіночої особисти, рівність права в коханні та в жениханні дівчини з парубком, бачимо протест сина й дочки проти батька й матері, невістки проти свекрухи. В ліричних піснях дівоче кохання вільне, як пташка в небі: його не можна ні купити, ні задарити. Дівчина вибирає собі парубка, як парубок дівчину. Недурно ж на Україні в народі ходить давній переказ, що колись дівчата самі сваталась за парубків: кажуть, що дівчина було прийде в хату, де вона назнає собі парубка, покладе хліб на столі і сяде на лаві. То був знак, що вона хоче заручитись з господарським сином. Як до неї господар не промовляв і слова, то був знак, що його син не хоче женитись з нею, але кажуть, що люди мали за гріх давати гарбуза дівчині. [Іван Нечуй-Левицький. *Українство на літературних позвах з Московщиною. Культурологічні трактати*. – Львів: Каменяр, 2000.]

Журналістів з Європи відразу після приїзду перетреновано на східну культуру: чого не слід робити, щоб не виявитися цілковитим варваром. Наприклад, треба визнавати культ візитних карток. Подавати їх із пошаною обома руками. Під час розмови чи вечері нічого на них не писати, розкласти перед собою згідно з ієрархією, до кишені ховати тільки тоді, коли зустріч закінчиться. (…)

"Он" – це тип почуття обов'язку, яке завжди панувало в цій країні. Японець почуває борг вдячності, який неможливо сплатити, – до батьківщини, родини, норм. [ГМЄ, с. 302]

В японському мистецтві та філософії дзен трудомісткі вправляння, повторювані до нескінченності, призводять до майстерності: суб'єкт і об'єкт стають одним цілим. Лучник ототожнює себе зі стрілою, покупець із товаром, клієнт Прадо ототожнюється з Прадо: звичайний японець з дупла токійської квартири, завішаної лахами Прадо, в кедах Прадо, трусах, штанах Прадо з рисом Прадо на тарілках. Торгівельний рай Заходу постійно існує на Сході. [ГМЄ, с. 303–304]

3. *Read abstracts from the book by Claire Kramsch* Language and Culture *and John Lyons'* Language and Linguistics *where the authors analyze the social deixis in the European languages. (Note that "T" refers to more or less equivalent forms of French* tu*, and "V" to* vous.*)*

Markers of social deixis give an indication not only of where the speaker stands in time and place – namely in a "today" in the "here" of speaking – but also his his/her status within the social structure, and of the status the speaker gives the addressee. For example, the use of *vous* or *tu* in French, *Sie* and *du* in German can index either power or solidarity, distance or closeness. English used to have *you* for distance, *thou* for closeness; now English has only retained the *you*, but social deixis in English expresses social position by other forms of addressee like *Bill, Bill X, Mister X, Professor X* and the like. These forms of address index social class, as in the use of *vous* between parents and children that can still be found in some upper-class French families; they can also index generational culture, as the currently prevalent use of reciprocal *tu* or *du* among students or young people in France and Germany; they can also index a culture that wants itself to be egalitarian and democratic as in the informal forms of address used in the United States (*dear friend, call me Bill*). The police's use of a non-reciprocal *tu* to address North African youth in France expresses an explicit display of power; being addressed with *tu* indexes the subordinate or marginal place occupied by these youths in French society today. [Kramsch 1998, p. 41]

Social psychologists have investigated the use of T and V in terms of the concepts of power and solidarity, on the one hand, and of reciprocal and non-reciprocal usage, on the other. Generally speaking, we can say that non-reciprocal usage indicates an acknowledged difference of status. In societies in which non-reciprocal usage exists a socially superior, or otherwise more powerful, person will use T to his inferiors, but be addressed by them as V. But non-reciprocal usage has been on the decline in most European languages since the nineteenth century, except in the case of adults and children who are not members of the same family and in one or two more specific cases. This is explained historically in part by the spread of more egalitarian or democratic attitudes in Western societies and in

part by the increased importance of the solidarity factor, marked not simply by reciprocal usage as such, but more particularly by the reciprocal use of T. [Lyons 1981, p. 318]

- *What does the usage of polite second person pronouns mean in terms of Hofstede's dimensions?*
- *Think what other language phenomena (lexical, pragmatic, etc.) may be viewed as results of cultural differences, reflected in languages.*

4. *Read the abstract from the article on Mexican and American cultures. Get ready to perform a similar analysis of some other two cultures.*

…Mexicans and North Americans working together sometimes feel confused, irritated, distrustful. The causes lie not within either culture but rather can be best understood interculturally. Here are four perspectives.

Individualism

In the North American value system are three central and interrelated assumptions about human beings. These are

(1) that people, apart from social and educational influences, are basically the same;

(2) that each person should be judged on his or her own individual merits; and

(3) that these "merits", including a person's worth and character, are revealed through the person's actions.

In Mexico it is the uniqueness of the individual which is valued, a quality which is assumed to reside within each person and which is not necessarily evident through actions or achievements. That inner quality which represents the dignity of each person must be protected at all costs. Any action or remark that may be interpreted as a slight to the person's dignity is to be regarded as a grave provocation. Also, as every person is part of a larger family group, one cannot be regarded as a completely isolated individual…

Where a Mexican will talk about a person's inner qualities in terms of the person's soul or spirit (…), the North Americans are likely to feel uncomfortable using such words to talk about people. They may regard such talk as vague and sentimental, the words

seeming to describe something invisible and hence unknowable, or at the very least "too personal". The unwillingness to talk in this way only confirms the view held by many Mexicans that North Americans are insensitive…

Even questions about the family of a person one does not know well may discomfort many North Americans, since asking about a person's parents or brothers or sisters may also seem too personal. (…) the Mexican may see things just the opposite: "If I don't ask about the person's family, how will I really know him?"

…the Mexican depends upon relatives or close friends to help "arrange things", if there is a problem or to provide a loan. While this is by no means rare in the United States, the dominant values in the culture favor institutions which are seen as both efficient and fair.

In a business enterprise, the North American manager is likely to view the organization and its processes as primary, with the role of specific people being more or less supportive of that system. People can be replaced if need be; nobody is indispensable. When one places emphasis on a person's spirit or views an organization as if it were a family, however, then it seems just as clear that nobody can be exactly replaced by any other person.

Straight talk

The Mexican is far more likely to flatter, tease or otherwise attempt to charm another than is the North American whose culture has taught him to distrust or poke fun at anyone who "really lays it on".

Often the problem is hightened when there is a difference in the sex, status or age of the two persons in conversation. Mexicans may want to maximize these differences while North Americans may often make a great effort to minimize them. North Americans may be most sensitive to the way in which a businessman talks to a businesswoman, lest he be accused of "sexism", but the same values apply to "making too much" of one's age or status.

Mexicans, on the other hand, value one who has the wit and charm to impress another. Nor are titles or other indications of one's status, age or ability to be slighted.

The truth [e.g. giving wrong directions to a tourist – I.A.]

There are two kinds of "realities" which must be distinguished, objective and interpersonal. Some cultures tend to treat everything in terms of the objective sort of reality: this is characteristic of the

United States. Other cultures tend to treat things in terms of interpersonal relations, and this is true of Mexico…

Viewed from the Mexican perspective, a visitor asks somebody for information which that person doesn't know. But wanting to make the person happy and to enjoy a few pleasant moments together, the Mexican who was asked does his best to say something so that for a short while the visitor is made happy. (…) It is the range of situations in which this occurs in Mexico and the relatively sharper contrast of "truth-telling" standards in U.S.-Mexican encounters that is so notable.

Time [*Mexico is known as the land of* mañana – I.A.]

North Americans express special irritation when Mexicans seem to give them less than their undivided attention [*e.g. a woman bank teller talking to a boyfriend or filing her nails while a customer is awaiting her superior's approval for a check to be cashed; a taxi driver giving a lift to a friend who's going the same way. All these cases are interpreted by North Americans as lack of professionalism and respect. One may also consider partying: Mexican guests arrive at 9 or 10 when they are invited at 8. Often it turns out that they visit several parties per night. This party-cruising is also seen by Americans as lack of respect. Mexicans, however, are unpleasantly surprised when they see in North Americans' invitation cards the indication of time when the party is over. Mexicans consider it a sign of being slaves to the clock and inability to enjoy themselves*] [from Condon 1998, p. 85–93]

> • *Note that the Gricean Cooperation Principle (in this case, it is the Quality Maxim) is relative. Telling the way without actually knowing it results, in fact, from Mexicans' willingness to cooperate. Think of cases in cross-cultural communication when other Maxims (those of manner, quantity, and relation) are violated and this violation is expected due to etiquette norms.*

5. *Analyse the cultures as they are presented in the following texts:*

(1) I had shipped ahead a box of books to myself, right before I left New York to move to Italy. The box was guaranteed to arrive at my Roman apartment within four or six days, but I think the Italian post office must have misread that instruction as 'forty-six days', for

two months have passed now, and I have seen no sign of my box. My Italian friends tell me to put the box out of my mind completely. They say that the box may arrive or it may not arrive, but such things are out of our hands.

'Did someone maybe steal it?' I ask Luca Spaghetti. "Did the post office lose it?"

He covers his eyes. "Don't ask these questions," he says. "You'll only make yourself upset."

The mystery of my missing box prompts a long discussion one night between me, my American friend Maria and her husband, Giulio. Maria thinks that in a civilized society one should be able to rely on such things as the post office delivering one's mail in a prompt manner, but Giulio begs to differ. He submits that the post office belongs not to man, but to the fates, and that delivery of mail is not something anybody can guarantee. Maria, annoyed, says this is only further evidence of the Protestant-Catholic divide. This divide is best proven, she says, by the fact that Italians – including her own husband – can never make plans for the future, not even a week in advance. If you ask a Protestant from the American Midwest to commit to a dinner date next week, that protestant, believing that she is the captain of her own destiny, will say, "Thursday night works fine for me." But if you ask a Catholic from Calabria to make the same commitment, he will only shrug, turn his eyes to God, and ask, "How can any of us know whether we will be free for dinner next Thursday night, given that everything is in God's hands and none of us can know our fate?"

Still, I go to the post office a few times to try to track down my box, to no avail. The Roman postal employee is not at all happy to have her phone call to her boyfriend interrupted by my presence. And my Italian – which *has* been getting better, honestly – fails me in such stressful circumstances. As I try to speak logically about my missing box of books, the woman looks at me like I'm blowing spit bubbles.

"Maybe it will be here next week?" I ask her in Italian.

She shrugs: "*Magari*."

Another untranslatable bit of Italian slang, meaning something between "hopefully" and "in your dreams, sucker". [Gilbert E. Eat. Pray. Love. – Penguin Books, 2006. – 334 p. – P. 76–77]

CHAPTER V
Acquiring a Second Culture:
Problems of Acculturation

1. Acculturation
in cross-cultural communication

1.1. Forms and ways of mastering a foreign culture

Interacting, cultures do not only complement each other, but enter complex relations. This process reveals specific cultural features and results in borrowing the best and adapting to cultural differences.

The necessity to adapt is familiar for businesspeople, scientists etc. who go abroad for a short time as well as for students who stay overseas for a long time, for staff of international companies, missionaries, diplomats; and finally, emigrants and refugees, voluntarily leaving or forced to leave their place of residence. The latter have not only to adapt but to become true citizens of a new society and culture. It should be noted that immigrants are usually better prepared to adapt than refugees who are not, as a rule, psychologically ready to move.

The complex process of adaptation ends when a person achieves compatibility with a new cultural environment. This process is called **acculturation.**

The notion of acculturation. Acculturation was discussed in the beginning of the 20th century by American cultural anthropologists R.Redfield, R.Linton and M.Herskovits. At the first stage, they considered acculturation to be the exchange of cultural features that results when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first hand contact. The scholars argued that the original

cultural patterns of either or both groups may be altered, but the groups remain distinct. Other researchers believed that initial cultural patterns of both groups change (depending on proportional representation of interacting groups). Acculturation was viewed as an automatic process, leading to mutual cultural immersion and cultural and ethnic homogeneity. A less developed culture changed much more than a more developed (see [Herskovits 1972]). The result of acculturation was considered dependent on the number of participants in interacting groups. It is within the framework of this theory that the notion of America as melting pot appeared.

Gradually, scholars refused to see acculturation as a group phenomenon and started to treat it on the level of individual psychology. According to the new interpretation, acculturation has come to be viewed as changes in value systems, behaviour and an individual's social patterns. In other words, acculturation is now conceived to be the process of cultural learning. If enculturation is first-culture learning, then acculturation is second-culture learning. (The traditional definition sometimes differentiates between acculturation by an individual (*transculturation*) and that by a group, usually very large (acculturation).)

Research into acculturation became particularly intensive in the end of the 20th century. It is explained by a migration boom that is characteristic of today's world. By some estimates, more than 100 million people live now outside the country of origin.

Main forms of acculturation. In the process of acculturation, every human has simultaneously to solve two problems – to preserve his/her own culture and to integrate into a new one. The combination of possible variants to cope with these tasks produces the four main strategies of acculturation: ***assimilation, separation, marginalization*** and ***integration***.

Assimilation is a type of acculturation when an individual accepts values and norms of a new culture rejecting all his/her values and norms.

Separation is rejection of a new culture with preserving one's cultural identity. If it is the case, representatives of a non-dominant group prefer certain isolation from a dominant culture. If representatives of a dominant culture themselves insist on such isolation, then it is called ***segregation***.

Marginalization means loss of one's cultural identity, on the one hand, and absence of identification from the majority, on the other hand. This occurs as a result of inability to maintain one's identity (due to some external reasons) and absence of interest in gaining a new identity (possibly, due to discrimination or segregation on the part of a dominant culture).

Integration presupposes identification both with a new and with an old cultures.

Some scholars suggest more subtle divisions. They point out that if we use the degree of adaptation, its speed and voluntary/coercive nature, these criteria will lead to the following classification:

- **enculturation**. It occurs in childhood, when the "foreign" replaces blank spots (*tabula rasa*); there is no interaction between native and foreign cultures;

- **acculturation**. Adaptation occurs gradually and native culture is mainly retained;

- **assimilation**. Important elements of native culture are voluntarily replaced with elements from foreign culture;

- **accommodation**. It is treated as conscious adaptation of native culture (significantly simplified) to real or imagined foreign culture. Language accommodation (slow speech, simplified syntax and limited vocabulary) is probably one of the most studied peculiarities of accommodation;

- **discrimination**. Here, the foreign is consistently separated from native culture;

- **segregation**. Segregation (also referred to as ghettoization) is isolation of foreign culture within the framework of native culture;

- **isolation**. Elements of foreign culture are meticulously isolated from native culture (e.g. isolation was the cultural policy in medieval Japan, in the USSR and is still enforced in North Korea);

- **annexation**. It presupposes inclusion of foreign culture into native culture. This process is usually accompanied by rapid and forced assimilation;

- **expansion**. Here, native culture steps outside its borders;
- **expulsion.** Elements of foreign culture are rapidly and thoroughly eliminated from native culture (e.g. persecution of Jews, ethnic cleansing in former Yugoslavia). [Донец 2001, с. 114–115]

According to data, emigrants who arrive for a permanent residence (unlike temporary migrants) seek assimilation. People who come for economic reasons or to study achieve this goal quite easily. Meanwhile, refugees who have to leave their country for some external reasons psychologically resist breaking up ties with their country and assimilate longer and with many difficulties.

Scholars used to believe that the best strategy of acculturation is complete assimilation with a dominant culture. Today the goal of acculturation is thought to be integration that forms a bi-cultural or multicultural personality, which is possible provided the interacting majority and minority both choose this strategy: the integrating group is ready to accept values and beliefs of the other culture, while the dominant group is ready to accept these people, to respect their rights, values, and to adapt social institutions to the minority's needs.

It is usually believed that non-dominant groups are free to choose acculturation strategies. Yet, it is far from the truth. A dominant group may limit the choice or force non-dominant groups to certain forms of acculturation. Thus, a non-dominant group may choose separation. If, however, separation is enforced, i.e. if it occurs as a result of the majority's discriminating actions, then it turns into segregation. If integrating groups choose assimilation, then they are ready to accept the "melting pot" idea. If they are forced into this choice, then the "melting pot" turns into a wine press. It is but rare that a minority voluntarily chooses marginalization.

Integration may be only voluntary (on the part of the majority as well as a minority), since it is mutual adaptation, recognition of either group's rights to live as a culturally distinct people.

Results of acculturation. The essential result and the goal of acculturation is long-term adaptation to life in a foreign culture. It is characterized by relatively stable changes in individual and group consciousness in response to requirements of the environment. Adaptation is usually considered in two aspects – psychological and socio-cultural.

Psychological adaptation is psychological well-being in a new culture. It is expressed in the feeling of satisfaction, psychological health as well as a clear-cut feeling of personal or cultural identity.

Socio-cultural adaptation lies in that an individual starts to circulate without difficulties within a new culture and society, cope with everyday problems in family, everyday routine, at work or school. Since one of the most important indicators of successful adaptation is a job, i.e. satisfaction from it and prosperity, we may also speak of *economic adaptation*.

Adaptation results depend both on psychological and socio-cultural factors that are rather tightly intertwined. Psychological adaptation depends on a type of personality, an individual's life experience as well as on social support.

1.2. Acculturation as communication

Acculturation is based on communication. Just like native speakers acquire cultural peculiarities, i.e. undergo enculturation, by interacting with each other, newcomers get to know new cultural conditions and master new skills with the help of communication. Therefore, the process of acculturation may be viewed as acquisition of communicative skills in a new culture, resulting from long communicative experience.

Communication is interaction with the environment and every individual is an open system seeking participation in this process. Any communication has three interrelated aspects – *cognitive, affective* and *behavioural*.

Acculturation presupposes first of all the most fundamental changes in cognitive structures, i.e. modifications in the person's worldview. It is differences in the worldview, in categorization and interpretation of experience that serve as basis for cultural differences. At first, the individual finds foreigners' mentality strange and incomprehensible, since he/she is not acquainted with their cognitive system. The more the individual gets to know the culture, the more he/she expands his/her ability to cognize in general. The opposite is also true. The more developed is one's cognitive system, the more ability to understand other cultures one shows.

In order to have fruitful relations with people of other cultures, one should not only understand their cultures rationally but also one should share their feelings, i.e. one should perceive a culture on the affective level. To achieve this, one should know which emotional expressions and reactions one can produce, since every society has a certain criterion for sentiments and emotions. When the individual achieves a necessary level of adaptation to a different affective orientation, he/she may share with people of this culture humour, fun, admiration as well as anger, pain and disappointment.

The decisive factor in adaptation is acquisition of skills and knowledge how to act in everyday situations. The skills are subdivided into technical, important for every society member (shopping, tax payment, etc.) and social that are usually less specific than technical and are more difficult to master. Even native speakers, who play their social 'roles' naturally, can explain very rarely what, how and why they act in a certain way. Nevertheless, by the method of trial and error, the individual's behaviour is constantly evolving. It gradually gets organized in a pattern and stereotypes that can be used automatically, without thinking.

Complete adaptation means that all the three aspects of communication take place simultaneously, in co-ordination and balance. In the process of adaptation to new cultures, people usually feel lack of one or several of these aspects, which results in poor balancing and co-ordination. For example, one may know a lot about a culture but may lack contact on the affective level. If this gap is huge, one may be unable to adapt.

Personal communication is closely connected with social interaction that is manifold – from simple observation of people in the street and reading about people and events in mass media to contacts with friends. Social communication is, as a rule, divided into interpersonal (between different people) and mass (a more general form of social behaviour of an individual who interacts with his/her socio-cultural environment without direct contact with separate people). The larger is the experience in social communication, the better an individual adapts to a new culture. It is, therefore, desirable to have more friends – representatives of a new culture and actively follow mass media messages.

2. Acculturation
and second language acquisition

Second language learning and second culture learning are sometimes likened to *schizophrenia*, where social encounters become inherently threatening, and defense mechanisms are employed to reduce the trauma. Virtually every encounter with people in a foreign culture is an "intense relationship" in which tremendous effort is expended to keep communication from breaking down.

We will consider stages of acculturation in their relation to second language acquisition. One should remember that perfect knowledge of a foreign language is rare. People who come to live for different reasons in other cultures, have to master their language as well. More often than not, the result of language contact appears to be **pidginization**, where communicators end up speaking a hybrid language that is functional only for day-to-day interaction, for business 'on the street'. The grammar and vocabulary are always highly restricted. Of particular importance here is that the person who speaks a pidgin is stigmatized. The language itself is frozen; it does not develop into a fully communicative, elaborated code. In like manner, the speakers of the pidgin are, by definition, "fossilized" (i.e. fixed in one place, highly resistant to change) both linguistically and socially.

One of the possible models of acculturation entails four stages:

- *Tourist*. The early stage, in which the new culture is almost totally inaccessible; the phase often referred to as entailing some degree of culture shock. The spoken language might be termed "phrasebookese". People draw extensively on the first language strategies and resources.
- *Survivor*. The stage of functional language and functional understanding of the culture. One must pass through this stage to be considered an educated, competent speaker of the language. Many do not. For example, manual labor jobs often require little more than "survivor" competence in language and culture. To remain at this stage is to speak something akin to a 'pidgin'.

ACCULTURATION THRESHOLD

- *Immigrant.* The degree of acculturation we expect of an educated learner, one who is literate in his/her own language. It is the stage reached by most literate people who spend an extended period of time working and living in a foreign country. Most, however, do not progress beyond this stage.
- *Citizen.* The stage that is almost at the level of the native speaker, in which one has acculturated to the degree that one is only rarely tripped up by the subtleties of the language and culture. We would expect this person to have both pronunciation and gestures very similar to those of natives.

The studies suggest that the biggest "leap" is between stages 2 and 3 (what is termed the *acculturation threshold*). In the first two stages, the learner is psychologically still anchored to the first-language identity. The transition from stage two to stage three is crucial in that regard. (It is interesting, in this connection, how the acculturation stages correspond to Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of "human needs": the need for food and security corresponds to stage 1, the need to develop a clear sense of identity – to stage 2, need of self-esteem – to stage 3, and self-actualization – to stage 4.)

One's experience of acculturation very much depends on the psychological health of the first language ego. If learners have strong self-esteem in their own culture, their chances of becoming true "citizens" of another culture are enhanced significantly.

3. Acculturation stress

When the individual leaves his/her usual cultural environment and finds himself/herself in a different culture, he/she always has to get over a spectrum of new feelings. Many of the feelings will be unexpected and sometimes very strong, they may spur misunderstanding and even hostility to the new culture. The discovery that others deal with a familiar

problem differently from the way you deal with it can be disturbing and exciting at the same time. Even everyday routine trifles, such as absence in shops of habitual foodstuffs or different opening hours, left-hand traffic etc. may become a source of irritation.

In particular, a lot of misunderstandings occur about dishes of national cuisine and some patterns of everyday behaviour. Actually, gastronomic differences are usually the first to be noticed and native food is probably the first to be missed, when abroad. Cf.:

> С едой у меня [в Германии — *I.A.*] тоже долго не ладилось, я уже научилась пересаживаться с "убана" на "есбан", покупать проездную карточку на "Zoo", а русскому проще защитить диссертацию, чем, бросив деньги в автомат для проездных, нажать нужную кнопку. Я уже привыкла к тому, что если вода или свет не выключаются тем способом, которым включались, то не надо звать горничную и извиняться, что "вот у меня тут сломалось", а ждать, что через минуту само выключится. Я уже вошла в то, что разговорный немецкий отличается от выученного не меньше, чем английский от американского; научилась передвигаться в пространстве не как туристический Мармеладов, которому на самом деле некуда идти и каждую секунду он выглядит как лошадь на витрине; но бродить километрами супермаркетов так и осталось для меня пыткой. Все эти баночки, флакончики, коробочки и пакетики не вызывали отделения желудочного сока. Они были чужие, они были фиктивные, казалось, что употреблять их внутрь так же не физиологично, как трахаться с инопланетянами.
>
> Мне было невкусно везде — в гостях, гостинице, ресторане, буфете. [АМВНД, с. 139—140]
>
> ...мы с Карен написали книгу о русской кухне. (...) Это, конечно, адаптация для местных условий, поэтому ее должна была писать англичанка. Здесь из-за разницы климатических условий и энергетической отдачи едят во много раз меньше... Все наши рецепты и порции пришлось уменьшать и утоньшать.
>
> Вот, например, приходит к нам в гости один профессор, мы ему подаем гречневую кашу в лучшем виде, он застыл и говорит: "Это же корм для животных!"

А теперь, как специалист по кулинарии, я хочу произнести речь в защиту макарон. В нашей стране происходит чудовищное надругательство над макаронами, и я, как человек, живший в Италии и понявший макаронную культуру, хочу спасти ее от русской дискредитации (...)

Мы привыкли относиться к макаронам, как к чему-то, связанному с армейско-пионерско-лагерной столовой. Только в Италии я понял, как важно макароны не переваривать; это целое искусство, когда стоит повар и, сдвинув брови, пробует макароны. Готовые макароны как бы еще твердые, но уже мягкие; они сварены "аль-денте", то есть "не зубок", я не побоялся бы сравнить их с грудью молодой женщины. Макароны в Италии варят от восьми до четырнадцати минут.

Макароны, вермишель — это все итальянские фамилии фабрикантов, придумавших свой сорт. Господа Макарони, Вермичелли, Фузили, Равиоли — создатели общей культуры под названием "паста". На моих глазах однажды произошло столкновение двух культур: культуры нашей, маннокашной-пионерской и "паста". Я наблюдал это, когда приехавший из Ленинграда эмигрант подрабатывал в местном ресторане на мытье посуды. Когда начался обед, ему принесли спагетти и спрашивают, какой тебе соус. Он говорит: мне этого не надо, дайте молочка и сахара. Залил все это молоком, посыпал сахаром и размял ложкой, а потом уплел на глазах у изумленных итальянцев. Клянусь вам, что остановились все рестораны на улице, потому что народ сбежался посмотреть на него, у некоторых в глазах стояли слезы жалости. Такого в Италии за двести пятьдесят лет производства макарон не видели. [АММЗЖ, с. 153—154]

The notion of culture shock was introduced by an American scholar Kalervo Oberg. Oberg gave a talk to the Women's Club of Rio de Janeiro on August 3, 1954, explaining feelings common to those facing their first cross-cultural experience. In so doing, he identified stages of culture shock which continue to be commonly used. Oberg's talk was published later in 1954. The anthropologist notices that entering a new culture is accompanied by a number of unpleas-

ant feelings. Culture shock is associated with feelings of estrangement, anger, hostility, indecision, frustration, unhappiness, sadness, loneliness, homesickness, and even physical illness. The person suffering culture shock, views his/her own new world with resentment, and alterates between being angry at others for not understanding him/her and being filled with self-pity. In other words, the symptoms of culture shock are

- stress, caused by efforts to achieve psychological adaptation;
- feeling of loss of friends, status, profession, property;
- feeling of loneliness (estrangement) in a new culture that may be transformed into rejection of this culture;
- breach of role expectations and self-identity;
- anxiety that transforms into indignation and disgust caused by awareness of cultural differences;
- feeling of inferiority, caused by inability to cope with the situation.

The main cause of culture shock is cultural differences. Each culture suggests a number of symbols and images, behavioural stereotypes that help the individual to act automatically in various situations. In a new culture, the usual orientation system becomes inadequate, since it is based on different symbols, ideas, stereotypes, norms and values.

An American scholar R.Weaver likens this situation with a clash of two icebergs: it is underwater parts, the level of the covert, where the clash of values and mentalities occurs. Weaver argues that the clash of the two cultural icebergs reveals the part of cultural perception that used to be unconscious and the individual begins to examine attentively both his/her own and the new cultures. The individual is usually surprised to discover this covert system that controls his/her behaviour. Culture shock is a form of anxiety that results from the loss of commonly perceived and understood signs and symbols of social intercourse. The individual undergoing culture shock reflects his/her anxiety and nervousness about cultural differences through any number of defensive mechanisms: repression, regression, isolation and rejection. These defensive attitudes speak, in behavioural

terms, of a basic underlying insecurity which may encompass loneliness, anger and frustration. With the familiar props, cues, and clues of cultural understanding removed, the individual becomes disoriented, afraid of, and alienated from the things that he/she knows and understands. (There is a term, "culture bump" that should be differentiated from "culture shock". A **culture bump** occurs when an individual from one culture finds himself or herself in a different, strange, or uncomfortable situation when interacting with persons of a different culture. This phenomenon results from a difference in the way people from one culture behave in a particular situation from people in another culture [Archer 1998, p. 170].)

Culture shock is closely related to communication. Everybody perceives their ability to communicate as something usual and does not realize how important this ability is. Unsuccessful communication brings about pain and disappointment. The realization does not, however, lead to awareness of one's own inability to adequately communicate. The matter is not about the lack of language competence but about the ability to decipher cultural information of a different cultural environment. Reasons for communicative failures lie in the lack of psychological compatibility with native speakers, the inability to understand and accept their values.

Symptoms of culture shock are various: from minor emotional disorders to serious stress, psychosis, alcoholism and suicide. Culture shock is usually expressed in excessive concern with clean dishes, clothes, quality of water and food, psychosomatic disorders, general anxiety, insomnia and fear. Sometimes, culture shock may develop for months or years.

And yet, culture shock has also positive consequences. Modern scientists view it as normal reaction, as part of the usual process of adaptation to new conditions. Moreover, due to culture shock, the individual acquires knowledge about a new culture and behaviour patterns, becomes more developed culturally. Therefore, since the early 90s, specialists prefer speaking of *acculturation stress* rather than culture shock.

Stages of acculturation. It is feasible to think of acculturation stress as one of five successive stages of acculturation (a so-called U-curve). The *first stage* is the period of excitement and euphoria over

the newness of the surroundings. This stage is called "*honeymoon*". The majority of people going abroad are full of optimism and hope. Still, this period does not last long.

The *second stage* (*disintegration stage*) – acculturation stress – emerges as the individual feels the intrusion of more and more cultural differences into his/her own image of self and security. At this stage the individual relies on and seeks out the support of his/her fellow countrymen in the second culture, taking solace in complaining about local customs and traditions, seeking escape from his/her predicament. Psychological factors, caused by lack of understanding on the part of locals, become more important. As a result, one feels disappointed, frustrated and even depressed. These are actually symptoms of culture shock. That is why many migrants try to escape from reality communicating mainly with their fellow countrymen and complaining about life.

The *third stage* (*reintegration stage*) is critical, as acculturation stress reaches its peak. It may lead to somatic and psychic disorders. A part of migrants give in and return home. The majority, however, manages to overcome cultural differences, learn the language, get to know the local culture, make new friends where they find support.

The *fourth stage* (*autonomy stage*) is one of gradual, and at first tentative recovery: some problems of acculturation are solved while other problems continue for some time. The person begins to accept the differences in thinking and feeling that surround him/her, slowly becoming more empathic with the persons in the second culture.

The *fifth stage* (*interdependence stage*) is near or complete recovery, either assimilation or integration, acceptance of the new culture and self-confidence in the "new" person that has developed in this culture. The process of adaptation may last from several months up to four or five years.

Thus, we get a U-like curve of culture shock development. The U-curve is characterized by the following stages: good, worse, bad, better, good.

One should also mention the notion of ***anomie*** (i.e. feeling of social uncertainty and dissatisfaction). As an individual begins to lose some of the ties of his/her native culture and adapt to the second culture, he/she experiences feelings of chagrin or regret, mixed with the fearful antici-

pation of entering a new group. Anomie might be described as the first symptom of the third stage of acculturation stress, a feeling of homelessness, where the individual feels neither bound firmly to his/her own culture nor fully adapted to the second culture. The strongest dose of anomie is experienced when linguistically a person begins to "master" a foreign language. The mixture of anomie and increased skill in the language sometimes leads persons to revert or to "regress" back to their native language – seek out situations in which they could speak it. Such an urge corresponds to the tentativeness of the third stage of acculturation stress – periodic reversion to the escape mechanisms acquired in the stage of culture shock. Only until the person is well into the third stage, do feelings of anomie decrease as the learner is "over the hump" in the transition from one culture to another.

Interestingly, when successfully adapted people return home, they have to face the need of reverse adaptation (re-adaptation) to their own culture. They are believed to undergo *reverse culture shock* (also known as *re-entry shock* or *own culture shock*). It results from the psychosomatic and psychological consequences of the readjustment process to the primary culture. The affected person often finds this more surprising and difficult to deal with than the original culture shock. It reproduces to a certain extent a U-line: at first, people are happy to return, to meet friends but then start to notice some features of the native culture that seem strange and unusual, and only then do they adapt to their previous lifestyle.

The mentioned models are not universal. Tourists, for instance, during their short-term stay in a foreign country, do not feel any acculturation stress and do not undergo adaptation. Due to strong motivation, people arriving in a place of permanent residence adapt in a different way, since they are ready to get fully involved in life of a new society and change their identity.

Acculturation stress factors

How much pronounced and lasting acculturation stress is depends on many factors. They may be divided into two groups – *internal* (*individual*) and *external* (*group*).

The first set of factors is made up of individual characteristics of people – sex, age, motivation, life experience, and personal qualities.

It is believed that ***age*** is the most essential adaptation factor. The older the person is, the harder and the longer he/she overcomes ac-

culturation stress, the longer it takes to get used to models of a new culture. Thus, little children adapt more quickly and successfully, school-children have bigger difficulties, while elderly people are practically incapable of adaptation and acculturation.

Sex also influences adaptation and duration of acculturation stress. It used to be thought that women experience more difficulties to adapt to a new surrounding than men. Modern data show that this holds for women from traditional societies, whose role is reduced to household and the limited family circle. Women from developed countries do not show any differences in their abilities to acculturation in comparison with men. Some data on American women have shown that females adjust to new conditions better than men.

Scholars consider that the factor of ***education*** is one of the most important. Education, even without cultural content, expands the individual's mind. The more complex is the worldview of the individual, the more easily and quickly the individual accepts innovations.

Vitally important here are ***motives*** of adaptation. The strongest motivation is characteristic of immigrants who seek to move to a place of permanent residence and become a full-right member of a new culture. Strong motivation is also typical of students that get education abroad and are also eager to adapt as quickly as possible to achieve their goals. Things are much worse with forced refugees who did not want to leave their country and do not intend to get used to new conditions. Immigrants' motivation determines how much they learn a new language, history and culture of the country of destination. This knowledge facilitates adaptation.

Another internal factor of acculturation stress management is ***individual life experience***. If the individual has already stayed in a foreign environment, this experience provides quicker adaptation.

Adaptation is also easier if one has friends among locals who help with all the necessary information. Contacts with co-patriots, living in this country, provide with support (social, emotional, even financial) but there is always danger of being locked within their narrow circle which only exacerbates the feeling of estrangement. That is why many services dealing with immigrants try to reduce their presence in homogeneous groups, since it is believed to hinder quick adaptation and may become the reason for ethnic biases.

In addition, one may distinguish a certain universal set of **traits** that enable the individual to adjust to life in a new culture: professional competence, open mind, high self-esteem, communicability, interest in other people, willingness to co-operate, tolerance to uncertainty, inner self-control, courage and persistence, empathy. Life experience, however, shows that having these qualities does not always mean success. If values of a new culture differ too much from the traits, mentioned above, i.e. if cultural distance is too large, adaptation is very complicated.

The external factors of acculturation stress are cultural distance, cultural peculiarities, immigration policy of a state, etc.

Cultural distance is a degree of difference between the native culture and a new culture. Adaptation is influenced not so much by cultural distance itself but the individual's ideas about this distance. The feeling of cultural distance depends on many factors: wars or conflicts in the past or present, knowledge of a foreign language and culture etc. Cultural distance may subjectively be perceived as greater or smaller that it, in fact, is. In the both cases, acculturation stress will last longer and adaptation will be complicated.

Cultural peculiarities. The most painful adaptation is observed with representatives of cultures where the notion of "face" is extremely important. If it is the case, the individual is very touchy about mistakes and lack of knowledge, inevitable in the process of adaptation. Also, representatives of "great states" experience much more difficulties in adaptation, since they are used to others adapting to them rather than vice versa.

Conditions in a new country. Locals may be friendly to foreigners, ready to help and communicate with newcomers. It is much easier to adapt in a *pluralist society* than in totalitarian or orthodox ones. Thus, it is much easier to get adjusted in the states like Canada and Sweden, where the state policy proclaims pluralism. One cannot but mention such factors as *economic* and *political stability* in the country, *crime rate* which determines security, possibility to communicate with representatives of other cultures, adequate position of the mass media that create emotional and public opinion of other ethnic and cultural groups.

Clearly, acculturation stress is a complex and painful state. But it shows that one undergoes personal development, breaks stereotypes,

which requires a lot of physical and psychological resources. As a result, one creates a new world picture, based on acceptance and understanding of cultural diversity, one eliminates the dichotomy "we - they", one develops tolerance to the new and the unusual. The main achievement here is the ability to live in the ever-changing world, where borders become transparent and immediate contacts with people gain more and more importance.

4. M.J. Bennett's Model of Adaptation

According to Milton Bennett, a person should develop certain intercultural sensitivity – the degree of cognitive sensitivity one establishes within oneself toward other cultures while still retaining a link to one's own [Bennett 1998]. People should be aware not so much of their commonalities but of their differences, since it is differences and unawareness of them that complicate or even hinder CCC.

Bennett believes that understanding of cultural differences may be divided into several stages. At the first stage, the differences are not either noticed or recognized as such. At the next stage, a new culture is understood as one of the possible views of the world, intercultural sensitivity increases, the individual treats him/herself as a member of more than one culture. The final stages are marked by an essential increase of intercultural sensitivity, since the individual recognizes several viewpoints on the world. The crowning cherry of the process is the individual who consciously selects and integrates elements of different cultures.

Bennett's model does not only differentiate the initial, intermediate and final stages of development but also registers changes that occur on each stage. The scholar distinguishes between ethnocentric and ethnorelativist stages of adaptation.

The **ethnocentric stages** are:
- *denial*: isolation; separation;
- *defense*: defamation; superiority; reverse development;
- *minimization*: physical universalism, transcendent universalism.

Ethnorelativist stages are:
- *acceptance*: respect for differences in behaviour; respect for differences in value systems;
- *adaptation*: empathy; pluralism;
- *integration*: contextual evaluation; constructive marginality.

4.1. Ethnocentric stages

Ethnocentrism in cultural anthropology presupposes viewing one's ethnic community and its culture as central, main in comparison with others.

Denial. One of the forms of ethnocentrism is denial of any cultural differences between peoples. An ethnocentric personality does not accept cultural differences as such. Denial may be expressed through isolation or separation.

I s o l a t i o n is first of all physical isolation of peoples and cultures. If a person does not come across foreigners (others), there is no sense thinking of cultural differences. Today, complete physical isolation is next to impossible (only an unknown tribe in the Amazon region may turn out to be isolated), but relative isolation is quite frequent.

Certain isolation is typical of many tourists' behaviour abroad, where they seek commonalities with their own culture and therefore notice only familiar things. Thus, many Americans in Japan see only skyscrapers, McDonald's and cars. In other words, these people lack categories to distinguish cultural differences. Partial isolation may also be revealed in the use of too wide categories for cultural differences. Thus, there are differences in appearance between Europeans and Asians but Europeans usually cannot tell the difference between Japanese and Koreans.

S e p a r a t i o n means construction of physical or social barriers to distance from everything that is different from one's own culture. It becomes a means to conserve negation. In cross-cultural interaction, separation is far more frequent than isolation. Barriers are created along racial, ethnic, religious, political and other criteria, dividing people into numerous and various groups.

> People at this stage might commonly say things like:
> - *"As long as we all speak the same language, there's no problem."*
> - *"With my experience, I can be successful in any culture without any special effort."*
> - *"I never experience culture shock."*
> - *"All big cities are the same — lots of buildings, too many cars, McDonalds."* [Gore 2007, p. 151]

At first sight, denial may seem an acceptable form of CCC, since people, sharing this position, do not seek any conflicts until others keep the distance and are not hostile. At the stage of denial, people are more polite, than at the stage of defense. Still, denial has a very dangerous aspect – covert rendering of other, dissimilar people, into a different, inferior category.

It is important to note that denial is the privilege of the dominant population. Members of minor groups, whose difference is denied, are desperate to prove that the difference does exist.

At the stage of denial, the best way to develop intercultural sensitivity is to organize intercultural events – concerts, weeks of cultural exchange where one may get to know other peoples' music, dances, costumes, cuisines. It helps to form better understanding of the most general cultural categories. When the differences start being realized, the first reaction is increase of tension which leads to the next step – defense.

Defense. The individual takes cultural changes as threat to existence and tries to resist them. Since cultural differences are taken for a fact, defense, compared to the denial stage, is a step forward in intercultural sensitivity.

D e f a m a t i o n is the first form of defense. It means negative evaluation of differences as a result of negative stereotypes. Negative characteristics are ascribed to every member of a relevant sociocultural group. Slander may be attributed to a race, ethnic group, sex, religion, etc. It may be covert, e.g. the request at a seminar to confirm that a certain group generates problems. There are more serious forms of defamation, when negative stereotypes are argued rationally, when inferiority of a certain group is "scientifically" supported. These are the ways of extremist organizations.

The transition from defamation to the following stages is complicated due to hatred. Many people, aware of their hatred to strangers and understanding that it is wrong, prefer to return to isolation, thinking it the best state of all.

Defending one's cultural differences, one develops s u p e r i o r i t y , i.e. shows off one's high cultural status and is ignorant of other cultures. Anything foreign is perceived as something of a lower status. Theoretically, one may take classical evolutionism in ethnology as an example of superiority. It is based on Eurocentrism and considers all other cultures to be less developed. It is in the framework of this theory that we use the term "developing countries", implying that European and American ways are the models to emulate.

The stage of superiority is certainly more advanced than the stage of defamation, since here differences are evaluated less negatively, they are recognized though from the ethnocentric point of view. It is very dangerous at this stage to slide back to xenophobia. (Non-dominant ethnic groups and national minorities start to develop their intercultural sensitivity with the stages of superiority and defamation and stay at these stages for quite a while.)

> People at this stage might commonly say things like:
> - *"I know Americans have a different culture, but everything about it proves what barbarians they are."*
> - *"When you go to other cultures, it makes you realize how much better it is back home."*
> - *"In Finland, we are a small nation with a poor past, so our culture is not as advanced as France's, for example."*
> - *"Well, at least we are honest, something that cannot be easily said of people in other countries."*
> - *"We Finns don't know how to talk with foreigners (small talk), unlike other Europeans."* [Gore 2007, p. 152]

R e v e r s e   d e v e l o p m e n t   is an optional stage of intercultural development, some people manage to skip it. Reverse development means deprecation of one's own culture and recognition of other cultures' superiority.

Minimization. The stage of minimization is the last effort to preserve one's ethnocentric position. At this stage, cultural differences are openly

acknowledged and are not evaluated negatively, unlike the defense stage. They are seen as something trivial, natural, inconsiderable compared to cultural similarity. The concept of the human nature is maintained, which is illustrated by the famous "golden rule": do unto others as you have them do unto you. The rule implies that all people are the same but, though attractive, this approach is also ethnocentric, since people's "universal" characteristics are borrowed from one's own culture and mean "be like myself".

P h y s i c a l   u n i v e r s a l i s m   is the first form of minimization. It draws on the fact that people, regardless their race, ethnic group or culture, share physical characteristics, which brings about identical material needs and require behaviour, understandable for everyone. Logical consequence of these premises is the statement that all cultural differences are reduced to several minor characteristics. But it is important to realize that, though people do share physical needs, they are satisfied in different social and cultural contexts. Therefore, it is important at this stage to make people familiar with empirical material that emphasizes the role of social context in human behaviour.

T r a n s c e n d e n t   u n i v e r s a l i s m   presupposes that all people are a product of a certain principle or approach (more often than not its source is God). The best-known example is the biblical statement that man was created in God's own image.

> People at this stage might commonly say things like:
> - *"We are all children of God, whether we know it or not."*
> - *"The key to getting along in any culture is to just be yourself — authentic and honest."*
> - *"Customs differ, but when you really get to know them, they're pretty much like us."* [Gore 2007, p. 153]

4.2. Ethnorelativist stages

Transition from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism occurs through the change of the paradigm – from absolutism to relativism. The foundation of ethnorelativism is the presupposition that human behaviour may be understood only in a specific cultural situation, that

cultural behaviour does not have any "right" model. Cultural differences are neither good nor bad, they just exist, and behavioural patterns are regarded as acceptable or unacceptable depending on certain socio-cultural conditions. People tend to admit the necessity to live together in multicultural societies, therefore they should be ready to respect others and require respect for themselves.

Ethnorelativism is based on acceptance of cultural differences as inevitable and positive. The ethnorelativist approach leads to formation of a CC-competent personality.

Acceptance. The next, according to Bennett, stage of intercultural sensitivity development and simultaneously the first stage of ethnorelativism is the recognition (approval) stage. At this point, cultural differences are recognized as natural. First to be acknowledged are *behavioural differences* and only then come *value differences*.

The most obvious difference in behaviour is verbal. The individual starts to realize that languages are not different codes for communication, expressing the same ideas but a means to form worldviews, that our worldviews are determined by the way we speak (the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis).

This stage also prepares people to recognize relativity of cultural values – the principal elements of development of intercultural sensitivity. The individual takes into account different worldviews, i.e. the basis of cultural variations in behaviour.

> People at this stage might commonly say things like:
> - *"They kiss on the cheek when meeting — it doesn't have any sexual meaning."*
> - *"The more difference the better — more difference equals more creative ideas."*
> - *"Sometimes it's confusing, knowing that values are different in various cultures and wanting to be respectful, but still wanting to maintain my own core values."*
> - *"Where can I learn more about Finnish culture to be effective in my communication?"* [Gore 2007, p. 153]

Adaptation is characterized by more profound relativism, when the individual realizes that culture is not a thing, fixed in time, but a

process. Therefore one should say that people are involved in a culture rather than "people have a culture".

Adaptation presupposes development of alternative communication skills and behavioural patterns. Adaptation starts with empathy and is completed by formation of *pluralism.*

Empathy means the ability to experience feelings in the process of communication based on one's ideas about the partner's emotions. One should not mix up empathy with compassion. Compassion is an ethnocentric category, since it is based on the conjecture that all people are similar, that all people feel the same in the same situations. Empathy is easily differentiated from compassion. The phrase 'If I were him, I'd…' shows compassion, while the phrase 'I start thinking in a completely different way when I think over his/her point of view' indicates empathy.

Empathy is developed in the individual throughout years and requires ever deeper knowledge of other cultures, learning foreign languages, understanding various communication styles, high sensitivity to situations where one may apply alternative cultural values.

Deeper adaptation is connected with pluralism that presupposes not only simple awareness of cultural differences, but also full understanding of these differences in concrete cultural situations. It is possible only as a result of personal experience of life in a different culture. Usually, it takes no less than two years. Pluralism is typical of immigrants' children and of those who grew up in several cultures (for instance, cases when parents belong to two different cultures).

Pluralism is characterized by awareness of cultural differences as part of one's self, one's own identity. These people see respect for differences as respect for themselves. That is where pluralism differs from empathy, where the other viewpoint is still "outside" the individual. In fact, the result of pluralism is biculturalism or multiculturalism. Pluralism, being part of high level intercultural sensitivity, is generalization of positive attitude to cultural differences.

> People at this stage might commonly say things like:
>
> - *"I know they're really trying hard to adapt to my style, so it's fair that I try to meet them halfway."*
> - *"I greet people from my culture and people from my host culture somewhat differently."*
> - *"The more I understand this culture, the better I get at the language."*
> - *"To solve this dispute, I'm going to have to change my approach and think about the difference in status between me and my counterpart from the other culture."* [Gore 2007, p. 154]

Integration is complete adaptation to a new culture that starts to feel as native. This is a stage when a multicultural personality is formed. Such a person is psychologically and socially ready to understand many realities, is capable to act differently in a specific situation, i.e. this person is prepared to act within cultures, other than his/her own.

C o n t e x t u a l   e v a l u a t i o n is the first stage of integration, it describes the mechanism that allows a person to analyze and evaluate a situation which admits of several variants of cultural behaviour. At the stage of adaptation, there may be a situation when a person thinks of all alternative patterns as equally good. Contextual evaluation allows a person to choose the best behaviour pattern in a concrete situation: a person will act in an American way in some situations, while in other situations a person may choose to be Japanese-like. This form of integration is the top of development of intercultural sensitivity for most people. Further development of intercultural sensitivity for a non-professional is of no use.

Nevertheless, some people master c o n s t r u c t i v e   m a r g i n - a l i t y. At this stage of development, there appears an *intercultural* (*multicultural, marginal*) *personality*. It is outside cultural boundaries due to the ability to analyze a situation. This person does not have any natural cultural identity, just like the person does not recognize any absolutely correct behaviour. The person is freed from cultural restrictions and discovers that there are many ways of being "good", "honest" and "beautiful". This helps to consider cultures both objectively and subjectively, use this or that culture without any conflicts, get involved in different linguistic and cultural code systems. At the stage, it is not important which culture you represent and to

what people you are referred by others. It is complete freedom – cognitive, emotional, and behavioural.

> People at this stage might commonly say things like:
> - *"I'm in a state of "happily in-betweenness.""*
> - *"Whatever the situation, I can usually look at it from a variety of cultural points of view."*
> - *"My decision-making skills are enhanced by having multiple ways of seeing the issue."* [Gore 2007, p. 155]

Of course, a multicultural individual is an ideal phenomenon. The process of psychological growth from monocultural to multicultural person is the process of change, where new elements of life are combined with awareness what culture is. The process implies stress due to the need to adjust to pressure of the environment. Few people are capable of this. Moreover, the result of the process may be a split personality, i.e. psychic disorder, which makes the need to achieve the state of a multicultural person doubtful. Nevertheless, modern scholars believe that the multicultural person should become an important human and social value, the ideal that people should strive to achieve.

Reading and assignments

1. *Read the abstract on technical skills that are necessary to live in Great Britain. Think what skills are important to live in Ukraine.*

...каждое утро по почте приходят разные анкеты, и надо сообразить, что где писать. Жизнь здесь невероятно сложна на юридическом уровне, и среднему человеку нужно очень много знать. А русский с его безмерной верстой, с его неопределенным понятием времени, со словом, которое он дает, а потом берет обратно, выжить сам не может.

Уж как здесь ни обангличанился, как ни стал собранным, все же я без жены-англичанки часто бы оказывался полным котенком. Этот недостаток на бытово-юридическом уровне русскому человеку восполнить нечем. Здесь очень сложная структура общества, и нашими мозгами ее понять невозможно. [АММЗЖ, с. 145]

2. *Read the abstracts and answer the questions:*

(1)   What makes a language that particular language is as much a social as a linguistic question, strikingly so in the case of accents and dialects. Expressions may serve to carry their users' messages, but they also carry social values.

(2)   Learning the first language is a cognitive problem which involves the acquisition of a cognitive system. The resulting abstract representation of the basic categories of language, the acquired conceptual system, and ability to analyse and categorise, are all already available in learning a second language, a process which (…) is confined to learning the linguistic details of the new language. …the new language may be used by the learner to communicate ideas which are typically different from those available to native speakers of that language. [Language and Understanding 1995, p. 3]

> • *Give any examples that prove that expressions "carry social values".*
> • *Do you agree with the statement that learners of a second language may come up with ideas, different from those typical of native speakers? Give your arguments and examples (in case you support the statement).*

3. *Read the following abstract and answer questions:*

(1) The discovery that *anomie* could also occur in the foreign language classroom is fairly recent. To a certain extent learning another language does imply adopting other cultural norms and values in settings where the new language is "dominant". In the early 1970s Canadian researchers Gardner and Lambert discovered that one of the reasons that some pupils were no longer motivated to learn English or French as a second language could be linked to the problem of having to adjust their conception of the world. [De Jong 1996, p. 14]

(2)   …the process of developing a second language identity is that of essentially adding on another personality. There inevitably comes a time when learners become aware of their new personas in the new language, when instead of just "acting French", for example, they start "to be French" unconsciously, at least occasionally, perhaps doing things they would never think of doing in their native auras. [Acton 1998, p. 27–28]

- *While studying a foreign language, have you ever feel* anomie*? What can be done to minimize it? What should a teacher do to help the learner through this stage?*
- *Have you ever noticed your "another persona" while communicating in a foreign language? What behaviour patterns or actions of a foreign culture have you adopted?*

4. *Read the abstract on adaptability of the Middle Eastern students in the USA colleges and answer the questions below:*

Middle Easterners are the most adaptable. They may do such jobs in the US that they would never do in their own countries because they are considered inferior there. The roots of such behavior lie within a basic characteristic of their society. Social morality prevails over personal morality; thus, concepts of right and wrong, sin and shame, derive not from an individual's determination of appropriate behavior, but from what society dictates as the social norms. It is self-evident that every society has its own social conscience, a student in the Western world, the Middle Easterner observes and adapts to [that] way of life. On his return home, he reverts to his own ways. [Parker 1998, p. 94–95]

- *What cultural values (in terms of Hofstede's theory) help fast and easy adaptation? What values, on the contrary, hinder the person's adaptation?*

5. *Read the following abstract and answer the questions below:*

Після еміграції, а особливо – примусової еміграції, ніхто вже не повертається. Немає куди. Моя вимріяна Польща – друзів, сентиментів, спільноти – зникла після повернення із Франції, на щастя. [ГМЄ, с.103]

- *What phenomenon does the abstract describe?*
- *Have you ever experienced similar feelings? Tell what you missed most in one culture and what irritated you most in the other.*

6. *Read the abstract and identify acculturation stages the characters go through.*

(1) …Іще мені спало на думку, що я тепер зовсім одна, абсолютно й повністю. Усі телефонні номери в моєму блокноті – це номери моїх київських друзів та коллег. У цьому місті [в Лондоні – *I.A.*] мені подзвонити абсолютно нікому. Тут ніхто не знає, що я існую і що мене треба любити. Ця думка дещо злякала. [ПСНДПЧ, с.12]

(2) …I went back home for my enforced holiday. And was shocked to discover how French I'd become.

For a start, like my old American chum, Jake, I forgot the simplest English words. Words, it seems, are like felt pens. If you don't use them for a while they dry up.

I nipped into my parents' local branch of Marks and Spencer, and they'd changed the whole place around since my last visit at Christmas. So I went up to a young sales girl and asked her: "Where are the…?"

Blank. The first word that popped into the pre-speech compartment of my brain was "slip". This (pronounced "sleep") is not a petticoat. It is the French word for what I wanted…

The next word I thought of was "culotte", which is for women…

By this time, the M&S sales assistant was sure I'd gone into a catatonic trance, and was frowning up at me as if she thought I might suddenly collapse on top of her.

"Knickers," I wanted to say, but that wasn't it, either. What was the damn word?

"Underpants!" I shouted joyfully, and the poor girl jumped back a yard. (…)

Even when I could remember words, my parents said they detected a slight French accent. My ex-schoolmates put it more bluntly. "You sound like a Frog," they said.(…)

Unfortunately, I was lost. I didn't know who managed the town's football team these days (a teasonable crime punished by having to buy everyone a round of drinks.) (…)

Ah, yes, food. That was the worst problem. When my mum put her usual salad bowl on the table – uncut lettuce leaves, whole tomatoes, cucumber slices, sticks of celery – I felt an irresistible urge to ignore the mayonnaise and salad-cream bottles and make myself some vinaigrette. There was only malt vinegar in the kitchen, though, and some cooking oil of unidentified vegetable origin. I did my best

with the ingredients at hand, returned to the table with my bowl of dressing, and began tearing up some lettuce leaves with my fingers. It didn't occur to me that I was doing anything unusual until my dad asked, "Don't they have knives and forks in *Paree,* then?"

"Yes, but…" I didn't finish my explanation. Not because I'd forgotten the words but because I realized how stupid it was going to sound to say "you don't cut lettuce with a knife."

I cut the rest of my leaves with a knife, and took a long look at the celery. I'd never seen it eaten in France – they only eat the strong-tasting root, diced up coleslaw-style. Celery sticks belong to the class of vegetables, like swede and parsnip, that the French think only just good enough to feed to horses or cattle. Crunching into the hard, stringy flesh, I now agreed with them. Where was the taste? My palate seemed to have been spoiled. One hint of blandness in my food and I started to look around for the nearest hungry horse to feed.

Another difficulty was that I had become allergic to the idea of eating bread bought from a supermarket. How, I wondered, had I and this whole nation survived for so many years without a bakery on every street corner? It now seemed like a basic infringement of human rights.

I was a foreigner. [CSYNM, p. 286–290]

(3) … она никогда не вступала ни в какие отношения с жителями Гонконга. И верно: хотя она и спускалась с Пика, чтобы поиграть на скачках в "Счастливой долине" .., ходить по магазинам, посещать банк, пить чай в вестибюлях отелей или завтракать в Красном зале Гонконгского клуба с кем-нибудь вроде Монти, она вращалась в кругу англичан, а китайцев всерьез не принимала. Китайцы преуспевают в торговле, потому что не закрывают своих лавчонок до полуночи; это же беженцы, им нечего терять. В отличие от англичан, они не знают ни досуга, ни хобби, ни удовольствий. Играть на скачках или в казино китайцев толкает страсть к саморазрушению. Для спорта у них "кишка тонка". Магазины англичан строго соблюдали цивилизованный распорядок: закрывались ранним вечером, не работали после обеда в среду, а также в субботу и в воскресенье. Англичане – правители, а китайцы – их подданные. Народы – подданные Британской империи всегда были загадкой, разве не так? Китайцы – вообще загадка из загадок, непроницаемая, как их

косые глаза. Они в зоне вечной нерезкости, и чем ближе к ним подходишь, тем сильнее расплываются. [ТПКТ, с. 164–165]

(4) Когда я эмигрировала, то утешала себя мыслью, что всегда могу вернуться в исходную. Отправную точку. Что друзья так же будут ждать и любить меня, все вещи на полках будут храниться в том же порядке, а моя машина останется стоять в гараже. Все-все будет по-прежнему. Почему-то мне хотелось верить, что жизнь в городе не шла своим чередом, а замерла на том же этапе, но котором я ее оставила. Естественно, все оказалось совсем не так.

Друзья, действительно, по-прежнему были рады меня видеть, но их жизнь не стояла на месте, и все важные этапы я пропустила и в них не участвовала. Город тоже активно жил. Старые любимые рестораны и кафешки закрылись, вместо них открылись новые, незнакомые и потому нелюбимые. Здесь своя мода и свои известные личности, свои мероприятия и свои значимые события, о которых все знали, кроме меня. Все шло, развивалось и преобразовывалось. Мне же хотелось вернуться в город, оставшийся в моей памяти, в город, которого больше нет. Кроме того, Прага мне тоже стала родной, не менее чем Екатеринбург. Там появились свои любимые места и новые друзья. Может быть, дом – это не то место, где ты родился и вырос, а где тебе хорошо жить? [ПАЛ, с. 227–229]

(5) По моему субъективному мнению, русскоговорящая эмиграция здесь [в Чехии] действительно не самая привлекательная. Все лучшее осталось дома. Помню, друзья в красочных эпитетах рассказывали, как в Германии чуть ли не на каждом углу встречали советских теток в платьях-халатах с огромными розами в качестве рисунка, по пятнадцать лет живущих на пособия (sozialhilfe) и не знающих по-немецки и пары фраз. Так вот в Чехии то же самое!

Язык – это вообще дело тонкое. Кто бы мне ни говорил, что нас сто тридцать миллионов, что русский язык – величайший язык мира, все это верно, но нужно соотносить его с географическим положением. Жить в Европе нельзя без знания английского и родного языка страны, в которой ты живешь. По моему мнению. Иначе ты замыкаешься в определенных рамках, не оставляешь себе выбора и

обречен на общение только с эмигрантами либо периодически наезжающими русскоговорящими туристами.

Когда я только приехала в Чехию, я страшно стеснялась говорить по-чешски. Стеснялась акцента, боялась, что меня не поймут. Но тем не менее я все время пыталась и запрещала себе переходить на английский, хотя так было намного легче. Через месяц у меня появился чешский бойфренд, и я записалась на языковые курсы, через год поступила в университет, где образование велось только на чешском. Просто для меня альтернатива жизни в России подразумевала не только сам переезд и смену декораций, но и альтернативу общения.

Мне стыдно приходить в ресторан со своей приятельницей, семь лет прожившей в Праге и с трудом объясняющей, что бы она хотела заказать. Мне стыдно, когда к русской продавщице в магазине обращаются чехи, а она их не понимает! Или понимает, но не может толком ответить! Мне стыдно, когда русскоговорящий знакомый ныряет в городской бассейн прямо под табличкой "Ныряние запрещено", потому что не понимает, что написано. Мне кажется, это неуважение как к стране твоего проживания, так и к ее коренным жителям. [ПАЛ, с. 181–184]

CHAPTER VI
Verbal and Non-Verbal Means
in Cross-Cultural Communication

> I've learned that people will forget what you said, people will forget what you did, but people will never forget how you made them feel.
>
> *Maya Angelou*

1. Verbal means

Communication studies differentiate between the three layers of cross-cultural communication – verbal, non-verbal and paraverbal.

The role of language in communication cannot be overestimated. (Interestingly, according to some experts, three quarters of information during communicative interaction are transmitted verbally [Юсупов 1991, с. 100].) As it has been shown in Chapter III, language contributes greatly to development of behavioural patterns, since it is by means of language that the world is assessed and interpreted. Interpretations of the world are reflected in language and are passed on by its means.

In a language, each word or sound is given a certain meaning. Speakers of a language regard this meaning as conventional. There are about 3000 languages in the world and each language corresponds to a certain worldview. Therefore, communication between speakers of different languages is accompanied by situations of language discrepancy which lies in absence of full equivalence between meanings of certain words or even lexical lacunas in one of the languages (for more details see p. 77–83).

First of all, let us analyze the correlation between verbal interaction and its context. Here the notion of high- and low-context cultures is of use. Thus, in high-context cultures, it is not enough to listen to a verbal message. In order to understand the message correctly, one needs to know in what situation it was uttered, who uttered it to whom and how. Only if one takes all this into account, one can understand its meaning fully and precisely.

In low-context cultures, on the contrary, understanding requires only deciphering a verbal message. In the West, the old tradition of rhetoric presupposes exceptional importance of words, verbal messages. This tradition fully reflects the Western type of logical, rational, analytical thinking. Western European cultures take speech separately from conversational context, therefore speech may be viewed in abstraction from socio-cultural context. Here, the speaker and the listener are treated as two independent subjects whose relations become clear through their verbal messages.

In Asian cultures, socio-cultural context is essential, words are considered to be a component of communicative context that also includes personal features of participants and their interpersonal relations. The component is inseparable from ethics, psychology, politics and social relations. Representatives of these cultures are convinced that all these factors encourage social integration and harmony and are not just expression of one's individuality or one's own goals. Therefore Eastern and Asian cultures emphasize not so much verbal messages but the manner of their uttering, their correspondence to social relations that define communicators' social status.

It should be noted that Asians are more interested in emotional aspects of interaction on the whole rather than in meanings of separate words or expressions. Politeness in the East is more important than truthfulness. As a result, Eastern societies see the main function of speech in social harmonization. That is why Asians politely agree in cases when their sincere answer may be unpleasant for the partner. In these languages one may speak for hours without expressing his/her opinion clearly and straightforward. Even in an everyday conversation, a Japanese may say *hai* ('yes'), though he/she does not in fact mean consent.

Since verbal messages as such are not independent in high-context communication, representatives of Asian cultures pay more attention to manners and etiquette (e.g. during official negotiations with Chinese partners, one should be ready for artificially set up situations where one has to speak first, "to lay the cards on the table". If negotiations are held on the Chinese territory (Chinese like negotiations being held at home), the Chinese party may say that, according to their traditions, "the guest is the first to speak"). People believe that words they utter and their true meanings may be quite different things. Ambiguity and restraint become essential qualities in communicative process of Asian cultures.

Compared with Asian and Eastern cultures, Europeans and North Americans express themselves more straightforward, they try to avoid pauses in communication.

Styles of verbal communication. Every person has his/her own style of communication, which affects his/her interaction with other people. According to data, a communication style depends both on a person's individual peculiarities and on conventional cultural norms. Thus, *the communication style is a set of customary patterns of behaviour, typical of a person, that are used by the person to establish relations and interaction with other people.*

In communication, a speaker's mastery is revealed not only in correct grammar and pronunciation but also in the ability to choose the most accurate and adequate stylistic verbal form. Communication studies tend to distinguish between four groups of styles, valid for cross-cultural communication: direct and indirect; elaborate and succinct; personal (person-centred) and contextual; instrumental and affective.

Direct and indirect styles. These two styles reveal the degree of the speaker's openness. The *direct communication style* aims to express the speaker's true intentions and therefore presupposes straightforward communication, excluding conventions and hidden thoughts.

This communication style is characteristic of, for example, North Americans, who tend to express their ideas clear, straightforward and unambiguously. North Americans are usually eager to make their interlocutor speak openly and sincerely. The majority of North Americans believe that straight talk is an indicator of a person's honesty and conviction, whereas a conversation full of hints is associated

with dishonesty and uncertainty. Americans treat orders, expressed indirectly, as attempts at manipulation, i.e. intention to avoid responsibility for failure. Therefore, Americans encourage open exchange and usually say "What do you mean?", "Let's make it straight…" The American communication style is full of respect for individuality, appreciation of equality and persistence. Language socialization of North American children is oriented to sincerity and truthfulness in communication. Honesty and sincerity require, in their turn, to use corresponding words and expressions, reflecting the speaker's true intentions and values. This style shows respect for the speaker's face, aims to prove the speaker's position. This style is typical of individualist societies.

The *indirect communication style* helps to conceal and camouflage the speaker's true intentions, goals and needs. This style is characteristic of high-context cultures of Japan and Korea. Eagerness to preserve one's face and the partner's face in Japanese society makes the speaker turn to vague and even ambiguous meanings of words and expressions, to use hints or modifiers (e.g. *perhaps, maybe*). The listener is expected to monitor the non-verbal communication, to read contextual cues, to relate what has been stated to all information available about the speaker and the situation at hand in order to read the meaning. For example, the Japanese hardly ever lie, though it never occurs to them to tell the truth. Traditions of this people do not admit of saying *no* straightforward. When a Japanese has to refuse, he/she pretends he/she does not understand or doesn't hear the partner, or just tries to change the subject, saying a lot of meaningless phrases. The Japanese, unwilling to appear a persistent, pushy person, prefers to use such expressions as *maybe, possibly, probably,* etc. Japanese children from the age of two are taught to spare other people's feelings and learn this tactics from their mothers' behaviour.

Elaborate and succinct communication styles are based on different frequency of expressive language means and the amount of speech in general.

The *elaborate style* presupposes the use of colourful, expressive language full of metaphors, idioms and proverbs. This style is popular in cultures of Arabic people in the Middle East, where oaths and assurance help to maintain both the speaker's and the listener's faces. Thus, in Arabic cultures rejection of treats must necessarily be ac-

companied by assurance that the guest is really not hungry and addressing Allah to witness it. If an Arab expresses directly and precisely his feelings or thought, without expected exaggeration and persistence, then he will give grounds to suspect him in insincerity. The direct communication style, careful expressions, brief remarks and pauses will not bring success in communication with Arabs. Scarcity of words, highly appreciated by Japanese, will embarrass Arabs. If their partner is very reserved, they will just think that he is insincere and will continue asking until they find out what is wrong. In conversations with Arabs, one should speak more and louder than usually. High pitch means with Arabs frankness.

The *succinct style* is opposite of elaborate. Its main peculiarities are frequent pauses, silence and "low key" expressions. Only the absolutely necessary is said, not more, not less. This style usually dominates in collectivist cultures, whose main goal is to maintain group harmony in communication. Japanese and Chinese, for example, often use silence, especially if the communicators' status and role are not specified. These cultures view pauses as the means to control communication.

Like directness and indirectness, *personal* and *contextual communication styles* also express cultural differences in power distance (hierarchy). Person-centred communication style is informal and emphasizes the individual and egalitarian relartionships. The person-centredness is reflected, for instance, by the use of the pronoun *I*. The contextual style is status and role oriented. Formality and asymmetrical power distance are often emphasized. Personal pronouns are not often used. All information does not need to be explicitly expressed. Yet common background knowledge is assumed, or in essential parts conveyed during the interaction, often indirectly.

Instrumental and affective styles differ in the orientation to either communicator.

The *instrumental style* is mainly oriented to the speaker and the goal of communication. The style is based on supplying precise information in order to achieve a certain goal. The instrumental style helps the speaker to maintain face in communication as well as to preserve autonomy and independence. This style is typical predominantly of cultures that score high in individualism. For example, in

European cultures and the USA people are eager to show and realize their individual self. This style is particularly pronounced in Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden.

The *affective style* has the opposite orientation: it is oriented to the hearer and communication itself. The style presupposes participants' adaptation to communication, to each other's emotions and needs. As a result, the affective style makes the speaker avoid risky expressions and statements. To achieve this, the speaker uses a lot of vague expressions and avoids open affirmation and negation. If both of the communicators stick to this style, misunderstanding and wrong interpretations abound (e.g. the affective style is characteristic of Japanese communication. The partners should show intuitive sensitivity to meanings hidden between words. The words themselves are just hints at the genuine content, therefore none of the partners expects that words and expressions will be taken at their face value).

The styles of verbal communication mentioned above are to a certain degree present in all cultures and the use of different styles varies depending on the context (e.g., formal or informal situation, personal distance or current relationship of the interactants) but each culture evaluates them differently. Culturally, one particular style might be considered more appropriate in a given situation. In Finland, for instance, direct, succinct and instrumental styles are in general preferred when presenting information in professional contexts. There are, however, situations when Finns may become very indirect also in professional interactions. These involve, for example, occasions where there is a need to express criticism.

In addition to simply being interesting in their own right, differences in verbal communication styles are of interest because they can cause **miscommunication**, that is, wrongly understood communication. Incorrectly interpreted verbal messages can lead people to make prejudiced assumptions. If it is natural in a culture to express indirectly, this can be misinterpreted by representatives of other cultures as sneakiness. If a communicator answers directly, others might consider it rude and lacking manners. If one has a tendency to use many words to express feelings with many descriptive adjectives, some people might assume that one is insincere and does not honestly mean what one says. If one answers succinctly, people can draw false conclusions that one is emotionless and boring.

2. Non-verbal means

Language is the main means of human communication but it is accompanied by various non-verbal actions that help to understand and comprehend a verbal text. Therefore, perception of information depends not only on knowledge of the language but also on understanding of non-verbal signs. It is important to be aware that if partners are not able to perceive the content of a conversation, then they pay attention to *how* things are said.

Thus, efficiency of any communicative contacts is determined not only by the fact whether people understand words or other elements of verbal communication but also by their ability to correctly interpret visual information conveyed by mimic, gestures, body movements, tempo and timbre of speech. Though the language is the most effective and productive instrument of human communication, still, according to research data, people deliver no more than 70% of information via language. The rest is transmitted with the help of non-verbal means. The matter is that by verbal means we may convey only factual knowledge but words are not enough to express human emotions. Feelings and mood, impossible to be expressed verbally, are delivered by non-verbal devices. The sphere of non-verbal communication is made up of all non-verbal signals, sent by the individual and having a communicative value. These means cover a number of phenomena: mimic, gestures, body positions, timbre as well as various elements of the surrounding, clothes, accessories, etc.

Thus, *non-verbal communication is a set of non-verbal means, symbols and signs used to convey information and messages*.

The idea that non-verbal means appeared before verbal ones was first suggested by Charles Darwin who believed that the basis of all non-verbal communicative means is human emotions that express biological reactions to external stimuli. Scientists have proved that both humans and primates have in-born mimic, certain gestures, and body movements to express emotions.

Biological nature of non-verbal forms is revealed in behaviour of animals who perfectly understand each other with the help of poses and body movements. Moreover, domestic animals seem to under-

stand human mimic and gestures, human timbre, they avoid eye contact when they do not feel like fighting, etc.

Thus, non-verbal communication is the most ancient form of human communication. Non-verbal means turn out to be stable and effective in their primary functions and do not presuppose highly-developed human consciousness. Besides, they have gradually revealed their advantages over verbal means: they are perceived directly and therefore affect the hearer strongly, convey the finest shades of attitude, emotions, evaluation, etc.

The basis of non-verbal communication is biological and social, in-born and acquired as a result of human social experience. For example, mimic, with humans as well as with primates, certain gestures, body movements are in-born and serve as signals to get feedback. This is corroborated by experiments with deaf or blind children who did not have any possibility to see and then emulate the mimic to show satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Another proof of biological nature of non-verbal communication is the fact that its elements (e.g. pale or blushing face, widening of pupils, curling lips, frequency of winking, etc.) are hardly controlled by consciousness.

And yet, some signals of emotions inherited from our ancestors have changed significantly by now both in their form and their functions (e.g. a human smile – expression of positive emotions – is believed to have developed from aggressively bared teeth).

Social nature of communication is characteristic not only of people but also of animals: there are a number of rules of non-verbal communication (e.g. dancing of cranes, singing of birds). But animals are taught these rules through imitation while a person acquires them as a result of enculturation and socialization. Some norms of non-verbal communication have national or ethnic nature (e.g. Europeans shake hands in order to greet each other, while Indians put both hands in front of their chest and bow slightly). Non-verbal sign systems may also be purely professional (e.g. signals of divers and dockers).

Non-verbal communication has a double nature: it contains both culturally universal and culturally specific signs.

Signals may be intended or unintended which enables us to distinguish between

1) *behavioural signs conditioned by physiological reactions*: paleness or blushing as well as perspiration, trembling, etc.;

2) *unintended signs used due to the individuals' habits* (so-called self-adaptors): scratching of the nose, swinging one's leg, biting the lips, etc.;

3) *communicative signs proper*: signals conveying information about an object, event or state.

While speaking of non-verbal communication, one usually means additional information about the partner, delivered by appearance and movements. Gestures, mimic, poses, clothes, hairstyle, surrounding objects, habitual actions – these are all messages. Reading these behavioural elements facilitates understanding. Careful analysis of these sources provides information on the partner's personality – about his/her temper and inner world, mood, emotional state, communicative competence, intentions and expectations, social status, etc. Besides, one may learn about the communicators' attitude to each other, their attitude to the communicative situation (willingness to go on, desire to close communication), about their intimacy, about the type of their relationship as well as its dynamics.

Obviously, there are considerable differences between verbal and non-verbal ways of communication. Non-verbal messages are always situational, they may show the current state of participants but they cannot give any information on absent objects or events that have taken place elsewhere. Non-verbal messages are structurally synthetic, they are hardly discrete. Unlike non-verbal means, verbal elements (words, sentences, phrases) are always distinct from each other. Finally, non-verbal messages are usually unconscious and spontaneous by nature, non-verbal behaviour is practically uncontrolled.

Yet, if people deliberately turn to non-verbal messages, they do it for the sake of more exhaustive expression of their thoughts and emotions. This goal is common in all cultures but "words" of non-verbal language have different meanings across cultures, they are granted different sense. Thus, shaking one's head from side to side means 'no' for Ukrainians, while Bulgarians interpret this head movement as 'yes'. Non-verbal messages are to a certain extent analogous to oral and written speech, since any word, pose or gesture

correspond to a certain meaning in a certain culture. As a rule, people in communication achieve adequate understanding of non-verbal language if they relate it with a certain situation, social status and cultural identity of a communicator.

Profound and detailed discussion of non-verbal communication presupposes analyzing its main forms:

- kinesthetic means – gestures, poses, body movements;
- haptics – handshakes, kisses, stroking, patting and other touches to the partner's body;
- proxemics – use of space in communication;
- chronemics – use of time in communication;
- perception based on organs of senses (gustatory, olfactory, auditory, visual).

2.1. Kinesthetic means

Kinesics as term was first used in 1952 by by Ray Birdwhistell, an anthropologist who wished to study how people communicate through posture, gesture, stance, and movement.

Kinesics is a set of gestures, poses, body movements used in communication as additional expressive means. Human behaviour consists of 'kinemes' just like human speech is made up of words, phrases and sentences. Kinemes perform a complementary or a substitution functions, i.e. they complement or replace verbal messages. Kinesics includes visually perceptible movements that perform regulatory function. These are not only movements of the face or the body but also appearance, walk, handwriting. Elements of kinesics are gestures, mimic, poses and glances that have physiological nature (for example, yawning, stretching, etc.) as well as those of socio-cultural nature (widely open eyes, clenched fist as sign of victory, etc.).

Gestures and body movements

A gesture is a non-vocal bodily movement intended to express meaning. Gestures may be articulated with the hands, arms or body, and also include movements of the head, face and eyes, such as winking, nodding or rolling one's eyes. The boundary between language and gesture, or verbal and non-verbal communication, can hardly be identified.

Although the study of gesture is still in its infancy, some broad categories of gestures have been identified by researchers. The most familiar are the so-called emblems.

These are the means of non-verbal communication such as body position, movements of hands or arms accompanying speech and expressing the speaker's attitude to the partner, to an event, a third person, or any object. Combined with words, gestures boost emotional colouring of speech.

Frances Hayes divides gestures into three categories that will facilitate our discussion: *autistic gestures, technical gestures,* and *folk gestures. Autistic* – or nervous – *gestures* are made by individuals in response to their own inner turmoil and are thus not strictly conditioned by culture. *Technical gestures* include such complex systems of communication as the sign language of the deaf, the gestures of umpires and referees, military salutes, the signals of music conductors, traffic directors, and radio performers. Technical gestures carry uniform meaning for members of a specialized group and are usually taught formally.

It is *folk gestures* that are the property of a culture and are passed on by imitation. Gestures signal not only the speaker's psychic state but also intensity of the speaker's feelings. It is believed that gestures have social origin and therefore they exhibit cross-cultural differences most remarkably. Cf.:

> To express approval in public places, Germans do not clap their hands (like it is done in some other cultures) but knock knuckles of their fingers against the table board, whistle or shout. When counting, Germans do not bend their fingers, like it is done in Ukraine, but unbend the fingers of the clenched fist.
>
> Attracting a waiter's attention is also different in different cultures. In the USA, people summon a waiter by raising the index finger and saying *waiter* or *excuse me*. In Europe, it is done by tapping one's spoon or ring on the glass. In the Middle East, people clap hands. In Japan one should raise one's hand with the palm downwards, slightly moving the fingers, while in Spain and Latin America the palm should be raised upward and fingers should be clenched and unclenched quickly.

The greeting gesture is particularly diverse, since it may be a bow, raising of brows, a nod, a kiss, a hug, tears, hitting one's head until blood appears, etc. Cf.:

> We usually wave our hand from side to side. On Bali, in Indonesia, two lovers may greet each other by breathing heavily. People from Burma, Mongolia and Lapland used to sniff each other. Eskimo people greet a stranger by patting him on the head or shoulder. Inhabitants of the Amazon region express greetings by mutual patting on the back, while Polynesians hug each other and rub their partner's back. People from the Torres Island greet by bending their right hand to form a hook and then itch each other's palms.
>
> Greetings (and goodbyes) may be culturally specific to small speech communities even within the English-speaking world, though would very generally include waves, handshakes and smiles. The Afro-Caribbean community, for example, has a number of greetings, based on hand slapping with formulaic spoken phrases such as *Gimmi five!* It is important to note that the kind of greeting you give someone will depend very much on your relationship, where you are and how long since you saw the person. Thus you may hug and kiss your mother if you have not seen her for a few weeks, but it is unlikely if you only saw her five minutes ago. On the other hand, you would probably never hug your bank manager unless he/she happened to be your uncle or aunt.

Gestures, used in different cultures, may also be divided into *conscious* and *unconscious*, *culturally specific* and *physiological*. Thus, yawning or itching are physiological gestures. The majority of gestures, however, are culturally specific, they are symbols and have a pre-arranged nature. They may be classified in the following way:

- *Illustrators* – descriptive and expressive gestures accompanying speech and deprived of any meaning outside the context. These gestures accompany the ongoing conversation revealing its content. Illustrators are usually intensified when the speaker's enthusiasm is on

the rise or when the speaker thinks that the hearer does not understand (the so-called beat gestures are used in conjunctiomn with speech and keep time with the rhythm of speech to emphasize certain words or phrases. Other spontaneous gestures are more contentful and may echo or elaborate the meaning of the co-occurring speech. For example, a gesture that depicts the act of throwing may be synchronous with the utterance "He threw the money out of the window.");

• *Quotable gestures,* or *emblems*, are used as greeting or farewell, invitation, prohibition, humiliation, etc. They may be translated immediately into words but are often used instead of words, impossible to say aloud (that is why all insulting gestures also fall into this category);

• *Modal gestures* – gestures of approval, dissatisfaction, irony, mistrust, uncertainty, lack of knowledge, suffering, concentration, confusion, depression, disappointment, disgust, joy, admiration, surprise. They express the speaker's emotional state, assessment of the environment, attitude to objects or people;

• *Ritual gestures* (e.g. Christians cross themselves, Muslims, at the end of the prayer, pass two palms across their faces downwards, Mudra (Sanscrit) encode sophisticated information accessible to initiates that are privy to the subtlety of elements encoded in their tradition).

Though there are some universal gestures, it would be naïve to think that they will have the same meaning in every culture and may be understood without special training. In other words, similar gestures may mean different things in different cultures, which causes problems in CCC. Wrong use of gestures may result in very serious misunderstandings. Cf.:

In the Netherlands, if you twist your finger by the temple implying that somebody has just said something foolish, you'll be misunderstood, since this gesture means there that somebody has said something witty. If a Frenchman thinks an idea foolish, he'll hit himself over the head, while an Italian

hits his palm against his forehead. A Brit or a Spaniard will show by this gesture how much he is pleased with himself. A German, to show his approval of an idea, will raise his brows. An Englishman will express the highest degree of skepticism with the same facial expression.

An American politician in Latin America would emphasize that the USA were eager to help the country, he showed his friendly attitude to others. Still, his trip was not successful. His gravest mistake was that, when standing on the plane ladder, he produced the famous American gesture — OK. But in Latin America, this gesture is considered to be obscene.

A Swedish student, staying in Moscow, wanted to get a lift to his college, he stood on the side of the road and put his thumb up, keeping the hand clenched in a fist. In Russian culture, this gesture means approval, so his message was misinterpreted and no one stopped to pick the student up.

As to the meanings of the "thumb up" gesture in different cultures, one should bear in mind that in English-speaking countries it has three meanings. The first is used by hitchhikers. The second meaning is "OK". The third, when the thumb is raised up abruptly, means invectives. In some cultures, i.e. in Greece, this gesture is equivalent to the imperative "shut up".

Communicating with other peoples, many have the impression that people behave in an unnatural way. Cf.:

If we speak of ourselves, we point at our chest. This gesture will seem strange to Japanese, since they in the same situation would point at their nose.

Handshake became accepted all over the world only in the 20th century. In the past, such a direct physical contact was believed improper in many cultures. Chinese up to now try to avoid body contacts with strangers. Firm handshake is just as unpleasant for them as for Europeans and Americans patting on the shoulder: for Westerners, it means "Keep in good health".

Body movements also help people to express their feelings and intentions. Thus, a person shows more readiness to communicate if he/she faces the partner rather than stands with the side to the partner. Facing the partner may be extremely important.

> A Westerner may get into an awkward situation if he/she tries to talk with an Arab, while walking. The Arab will try to stop and go on with the conversation, since in Arabic culture people prefer facing the speaker and maintain eye contact.

In communication, body movements may be used to express the willingness to start or to close a conversation.

> Americans use several body movements when they feel like changing the subject, express their opinion or close a conversation: they bend forward, look away, change the position, often nod, touch the floor with both feet.

These subtle hints have, as a rule, practical effect and change the process of communication. Another example may be a person who is standing with the arms crossed, keeping looking at the watch and away. These are the signals it is time to leave.

Gestures and body movements often reveal the speaker's membership in a certain culture, even if the person speaks a foreign language perfectly. There are numerous jokes how American and Russian spies gave themselves away. Americans are easily recognized by their specific manner to sit, putting one ankle on the knee, reclining on the back of the chair. Russians usually reveal themselves by their habit to drink tea without taking a spoon out of the cup.

Posture

Posture is the speaker's body position and movements that constitute a very important part of non-verbal communication. This is one of the least controlled forms of non-verbal communication, therefore it reveals the person's true state much more than facial expressions. The matter is that anyone is taught from the very childhood to control one's face but no one teaches us to control the position of our

body. Posture may inform us whether our partner is relaxed or tense, whether he/she prefers a brief conversation or takes his/her time. Any change of body position signals some change in relations.

Posture can be used to determine a participant's degree of attention or involvement. The difference in status between participants, and the level of fondness a person has for the other communicator. Studies investigating the impact of posture on interpersonal relations suggest that mirror-image congruent postures where one person's left side is parallel to the other person's right side, leads to favourable perception of communicators and positive speech; a person who displays a forward lean or a decrease in a backwards lean also signify positive sentiment during communication. Posture is understood through such indicators as direction of lean, body orientation, arm position, and body openness.

Experts distinguish about a thousand of poses. Communicative theory divides these poses into the three groups:

> • *involvement* or *lack of involvement* in conversation. Avoidance of contact is signaled by arms crossed, leaning backwards, etc. Readiness to communicate is expressed in a smile, leaning towards the partner;
> • *domination* or *dependence*. Domination presupposes towering over the partner, patting on his/her shoulder; dependence – looking upwards, stooping;
> • *confrontation* or *harmony*. Confrontation is expressed in the following pose: fists clenched, shoulders stuck out, arms along one's sides. The harmonious pose is always synchronized with the partner's pose, it's open and free.

Like any other elements of non-verbal communication, poses differ not only across cultures but within a culture as well. They also depend on speakers' age and social group. Cf.:

> Almost all Westerners sit on the chair with one leg over the other. If a European in Thailand sits like that and directs the soles of his/her boots towards a Thai, the latter will feel humiliated and offended, while an Arab partner will interpret it as the worst humiliation, since the Thai and the Arabs believe the leg to be the most unpleasant and inferior part of the body.

Also, a North American may sit in front of the professor as he/she pleases, since a relaxed pose is not considered in the USA an indicator of relations. European cultures tend to treat relaxed poses as sign of social equality.

Facial expression

To read facial expressions is the most important skill in human communication. A facial expression can be more eloquent than words: a person may say one thing but the face may suggest that he/she does not believe the words. That is why facial expression helps to express ideas more fully, more precisely, and more clearly.

Human face is very pliant. Contractions of facial muscles change facial expressions and signal the speaker's state: grief, happiness, disgust, anger, surprise, fear, or contempt. It is believed that facial expression employs 55 components, whose combination may deliver 20 thousand senses.

Mimicry is made up of spontaneous and involuntary mimic reactions. On the one hand, facial expressions may give away feelings the speaker wants to hide. On the other hand, developed face muscles permit us to control our facial expressions, so that we may either increase or restrain or conceal our emotions. Therefore, to interpret facial expressions, one should pay attention to correspondence between the partner's facial expression and words. As soon as there is such correspondence, we do not treat words and mimicry separately. When discrepancy becomes quite striking, it is noticed by even an inexperienced person.

To boost emotions, we make our facial expressions more pronounced, according to the character and content of communication. Thus, we may exaggerate our joy over the present and boost our sadness in order to punish a child. Still, different forms, used to exhibit human emotions, often have a culturally specific nature. Cf.:

Laughter and smile in all Western cultures are associated with jokes and happiness. A typical smile of an Asian may be simultaneously an expression of positive emotions (affection, joy, etc.) as well as negative emotions (dissatisfaction, confusion, disappointment, etc.). In Japan, laughter

signals embarrassment and uncertainty, therefore there fre-
quently occur situations when a European gets angry while a
Japanese partner, being confused, smiles. If a European
does not know this feature of Japanese culture, he may
think he is being laughed at.

Quite frequently, we find ourselves in situations when we have to keep our emotions to ourselves to spare our friends or relatives' feelings. Cultural traditions play here the leading role. For example, if the norms of a culture prohibit a man from public expression of fear or tears, he has to suppress these emotions, otherwise he'll be disapproved.

Research on facial expressions and their universality suggests that there are approximately six basic expressions that are understood in meaning by people all over the world, regardless of cultural back-ground. The expressions in order of recognition accuracy are: happi-ness, surprise, fear, anger, sadness and disgust/contempt. It is proba-bly a matter of human survival that these expressions are universally recognizable. They give us the basic emotional tools to make our-selves understood anywhere with nearly anyone.

Though facial expressions appear to be quite universally under-stood in the most basic sense, that is, there are few culture-specific facial expressions, the *intensity of expression* and the *situational ap-propriateness of expressions* are indeed culture-bound and can vary significantly. Let's take the facial expression of happiness accompa-nied with a smile. Americans have a worldwide reputation for smil-ing often, and the type of smile is pronounced with teeth showing (which is culture-specific intensity of expression). According to the stereotype, Americans "always look happy", although undoubtedly many Americans themselves would disagree. Nevertheless, for Americans, it is considered culturally appropriate to smile in service encounters, and this is exactly the facial expression many visitors to the US would see (which is culture-specific situational appropriate-ness). In Northern Europe, on the other hand, smiling during a ser-vice encounter is not "expected" by the customers. Therefore, north-ern Europeans tend to perceive Americans as smiling "too much" or "unnecessarily", which might make them interpret the smiling as not genuine [Gore 2007, p. 87–88].

Social status of communicators and the type of relations are also important for display rules. Ekman and colleagues in Japan studies the facial reactions of students to a horrific film about ritual circumcisions of teenage Aborigines. When the Japanese students watched the film with an authority figure present, their faces showed only the slightest hints of reaction. But when they thought they were alone (though they were being taped by a secret camera) their faces twisted into vivid mixes of anguished distress, dread, and disgust.

All in all, there are several basic kinds of display rules. One is *minimizing* the show of emotion – this is the Japanese norm for feelings of distress in the presence of someone in authority, which the students were following when they masked their upset with a poker face. Another is *exaggerating* what one feels by magnifying the emotional expression. A third is *substituting* one feeling for another; this comes into play in some Asian cultures where it is impolite to say no, and positive (but false) assurances are given instead [Goleman 1996, p. 113].

Despite the fact that everyone is a rather experienced interpreter of other people's facial reactions, the individual may for a long time fail to notice the partner's facial expression, since some people tend to see only those signs that support their expectations. Sometimes people may also see only those emotions that are familiar to them, ignoring all other feelings.

Eye contact

Communication starts with eye contact, therefore eye contact is the main element of non-verbal communication. Eye contact means beginning of communication, it expresses attention, support or, vice versa, may be a sign to terminate a conversation. The term "eye contact" covers both direction of glances and eye movements.

Eyes express a wide range of feelings. Thus, a look may be stern, tender, playful, sly, pleading, pensive, reproachful, admiring, farewell, fleeting, misty, piercing, laughing, etc. Eyes deliver the most exact and open signals in human communication. Even if experienced communicators are able to control their emotions with the help of gestures and body movements, they cannot control reactions of the eye pupils. Pupils may widen or shrink and are beyond the speaker's control (this knowledge helps Chinese and Turkish vendors to decide what price to tell: if a customer is satisfied with the price, his/her eye pupils become wider).

Experts often compare a look with a touch of a hand because it psychologically reduces the distance between people. That is why a continuous look (especially at the representative of the other sex) may be a sign of love. Interestingly, according to studies, a human can take a stranger's glance without feeling discomfort for no longer than three seconds.

Cultures vary in their requirements to direction of glances. Cf.:

> In Western cultures, "direct glance" is a very important indicator in a conversation: if a person does not look at the partner, people take the person for insincere, since it is believed that a person avoiding eye contact is not trustworthy. Thus, Americans do not usually trust people, who do not look them straight into the eyes. So keeping eye contact increases trust. Absence of a direct look may also be interpreted as anxiety.

Eye contact may vary depending on the personality, sex and social status of communicators. It has been found out that domineering and socially adapted people tend to maintain eye contact, women do this more often than men. However, Asian women traditionally do not look straight into a man's eyes, especially if he is a stranger.

Eye contact depends to a great extent on a culture's score on the power distance scale. Thus, Asian employees do not look at their boss's face since a direct look may be considered arrogant and disrespectful. Cambodians, in their turn, believe that looking at others is humiliating, as it means intrusion into their inner world, looking away is a norm there. Japanese etiquette also requires a person to avoid looking at other people's faces, Japanese tend to fix their looks on partners' necks.

Different interpretation of eye contact may lead to misunderstandings. For example, if in the USA a white teacher makes remarks on an AfroAmerican student's behaviour and the student looks down instead of looking straight at the teacher, the teacher may get angry. The matter is that black Americans view looking down as sign of respect, while for white Americans a sign of respect and attention is a direct look. In public places (e.g. subway), however, Americans prefer avoiding eye contact with strangers.

Eye movements have been the subject of many studies. According to Hall, British have problems communicating with North Americans due to differences in eye movements. British are taught from childhood to listen closely to the partner. It presupposes concentration on one spot and immobility. British do not nod, only murmur slightly to let the partner know that he is being listened to. They seem to be looking straight at the speaker. British also may wink to show they follow the speaker. The look of an American, though it is directed at the speaker, veers from one speaker's eye to the other. Americans may even look away, which is unusual and offensive to British.

One should not forget of such a phenomenon as winking. With North Americans, winking means being bored. It may also be noticed in flirting. If Nigerians wink at their children, it means the children should leave the room. In India and Thailand winking equals affront.

2.2. Touches

Haptics is the study of touching as non-verbal communication. Touches that can be defined as communication include handshakes, holding hands, kissing (cheek, lips, hand), back slapping, high fives, a pat on the shoulder, and brushing an arm. The meaning conveyed by touch is highly dependent upon the context of the situation, the relationzship between communicators, and the manner of touch.

Comparing different cultures has helped to find out that communicators use various types of touching. These may be handshake, kisses, stroking, tapping, hugs, etc. Studies show that touches may imbue communication with different meanings and affect results of an interaction.

People touch each other for various reasons, in various ways and in various places. Touches are important in communication, since they stimulate and regulate conversations. Scholars believe that depending on the goals and types, touching may be divided into the following groups:

- *professional* – these are impersonal, a human is viewed only as an object of communication (e.g. medical checkup);
- *ritual* (e.g. handshakes, crossing, kissing a priest's hand);

- *friendly*;
- *intimate*.

Use of touches depends on a number of factors, among which we may distinguish a type of culture, persons' sex, age, status and temperament. Each culture is characterized by its own patterns, regulated by traditions and customs as well as partners' sex. Touching depends a lot on the role played by a man or a woman in a culture. In some cultures, men are forbidden to touch women. In other cultures, women are prohibited to touch men, though men traditionally allow themselves to touch women during a conversation. Cf.:

> Arabs, Latin Americans, people from Southern Europe, for example, tend to touch each other in conversations. Touching is not excluded from communication between Indians or Pakistanis. Latin Americans believe that avoiding touching means being cold with the partner. Italians are convinced that only unfriendly people fear to be open to touching. Japanese consider that only a person lacking self-control may touch the partner. For a Japanese, touching may also be a sign of hostility or aggression.

Touches as a criterion divide cultures into **high-contact** (touching is widely spread) and **low-contact** (touching is not allowed). High-contact cultures are Latin American, Eastern, and Southern Europe. Thus, Arabs, Jews, peoples from Southern Europe and the Mediterranean cultures use touching quite actively. North Americans, and peoples of Northern Europe, on the contrary, avoid touching. They prefer standing at a distance from each other. Germans, British and representatives of other Anglo-Saxon peoples hardly ever use touching in communication. Thus, in Germany and the USA, men preserve greater distance and hardly ever touch each other.

In Asian cultures, people show by touching their feelings of domination and superiority. Thus, touching someone's back or shoulder means friendship. In Arabic and some Eastern European cultures, friendship is expressed with hugs.

One may distinguish "tabooed" touches. For example, in Asian cultures communicators must not touch each other's head, as it is in-

terpreted as offence. Therefore, when Asian teachers beat their pupils over the head, the latter take it for offensive punishment.

Handshake may be an example of a Western greeting. Handshake (its intensity and duration) may be very informative. If the handshake is too short, weak, revealing dry hands, it may signal indifference. And on the contrary, long handshakes and wet hands inform of stress, feeling of responsibility. Too long handshakes together with a smile and warm glance demonstrate friendliness.

In fact, there may be distinguished several types of handshake, each of which has a symbolic meaning:

- a palm, turned upwards, under the partner's palm means willingness to subdue, an unconscious signal to the domineering person;
- a palm, turned downwards, on the partner's palm, expresses the willingness to dominate, an attempt to control the situation;
- a palm, turned vertically shows equality of partners;
- a "glove" handshake (two palms clasp the partner's palm) emphasizes sincerity, friendliness, and trust.

Europeans see handshake as inseparable part of greeting. Germans prefer strong handshake not only during the initial greeting, but also when completing a conversation. As a rule, the communicator, elder or with a higher social position, offers the hand. A woman is the first to offer her hand (unless the man's status is higher than hers). A man leans forward a bit, with the neck and shoulders bent forward. If a person enters the room, where there are other people, he should shake hands with everybody.

Thus, correct and skilful use of handshake may significantly facilitate communication, express trust and gain the partner's trust in return. In CCC, however, one should take into account differences in handshakes. For example, meeting partners from Asia, one should not squeeze their palms too strongly and long. Western Europeans, in their turn, cannot stand weak handshakes, since their culture appreciates strength and energy. Their hand should be shaken energetically and strongly; besides, they are used to shaking hands from three to seven times.

2.3. Distancing

Distancing (Edward T.Hall coined the word **proxemics** for this field of research) studies space relations in communication, i.e. it considers personalization of space that is viewed as the communicator's property. Differences in space management have been noticed by Hall who analyzed rules of space organization in communication as well as influence of territories and distances between people on their interpersonal communication. Special studies show that perception of distance differs across cultures and is quite important in communication.

As a rule, a person requires certain space that is seen as his/her own, and violation of the space is seen as intrusion into the inner world, as a hostile behaviour. Therefore, communication between people always occurs at a certain distance and is an important indicator of the type of relations between the people. Every one unconsciously establishes boundaries of their personal space. The boundaries depend not only on the culture but also on relations with a certain partner. Thus, friends tend to stand closer to each other than strangers. Besides, distance is determined by such factors as sex, race, circumstances etc.

Hall distinguishes between four types of distances:

- *Intimate* – separating sufficiently close people keeping their conversation to themselves;
- *Personal* – distance maintained by the individual speaking to other people;
- *Social* – distance maintained during a formal, official conversation;
- *Public* – distance during public events (meetings, lectures, etc.).

The intimate disntace is the closest to the individual, and it is the zone where the individual feels safe. Almost all cultures prohibit intrusion into the other's intimate space. That is why many people can hardly bear situations when somebody, without their permission, touches them, taps on the shoulder, etc. The individual must decide by himself /herself who may be allowed into the intimate space. As a rule, these are people who maintain close emotional contact with the individual: children, par-

ents, spouses, lovers, close friends and relatives. Anyone else who interferes with the intimate zone arouses strong negative feelings, up to disgust. The extent of the intimate zone is culturally specific.

> In Western European cultures, it is 60 cm. In cultures of Eastern European countries, the distance is smaller — approx. 45 cm. In the countries of South Europe and the Mediterranean this distance equals the distance from the tip of the fingers to the elbow. Partners do not only see each other well at this distance but also feel each other.

The *personal zone* round the individual's body is also very important for communication. This distance is approximately 45-120 cm. This does not presuppose any physical contact. This is the best distance for a conversation with friends or acquaintances, at receptions, formal events and friends' parties.

The personal space depends on a culture and nature of relationships between people.

> In Asian cultures, personal space may depend on the partner's caste. As a rule, people of higher castes keep a conventional distance from people of a lower caste.
>
> Studies on communicative distancing, conducted in seven European countries, show that English tend to preserve a bigger personal distance than French and Italians. French and Italians, in their turn, keep at a bigger distance than Irish and Scots, while Armenians and Georgians stand to each other closer than Estonians.
>
> Germans communicate at bigger distances than Russians, and insufficient distances, maintained by a Russian, may be interpreted by a German as invasion into his/her personal space and aggression.
>
> North Americans prefer talking within their personal and social zones, while peoples from the Middle East and Latin America — within their personal zone but it is included in the intimate zone of Americans. Therefore, in Arab — American interactions, the Americans complain about interference in their intimate zone and try to increase the distance, Arabs try to shorten the distance. As a result, the Americans consider the Arabs imposing, while the Arabs accuse the Americans of being cold.

Ignorance of the personal zone in CCC may lead to CC conflicts, since people of different cultures feel ill at ease when their ideas of personal space do not correspond. Thus, Latin Americans usually talk standing within their personal space, while North Americans see this distance as intimate. Therefore the former consider the latter extremely reserved and cold.

The personal zone also depends on mutual affection or dislike. The more people like each other, the smaller is the distance between them. Still, cultural differences exist even here.

As a rule, representatives of individualist cultures actively resist violation of their personal space, while representatives of collectivist cultures in these cases resort to passive resistance.

> Invasion into the personal space is one of the most vivid impressions of Americans coming to Russia when they have to go by public transport, stand in a line or just speak to Russians. Americans are very unwilling to sit in three on the back seat in a car. If there is enough space in the classroom, American students always sit at a distance from each other, while Russians would sit closely together in order not to offend the neighbour.

The *social distance* is the space that is maintained in conversations between strangers or in communication with a small group of people, i.e. it is the space we keep speaking to people we don't know well. The social zone borders on the personal zone and equals 120-160 cm. It is most comfortable for official communication. This distance is usually observed at business meetings, discussions, press-conferences, etc. It is the zone of communication between teachers and students, bosses and subordinates, customers and sales people, etc. It is very important to have an intuitive feeling of distance, since violation of the social space arouses the partner's negative reaction and psychological discomfort that result in communicative failures.

The *public* distance is desirable in communication with a big group of people. This presupposes such forms of communication as meetings, presentations, lectures, reports, speeches, etc. The public

zone begins at the distance of 3,5 m and may extend further. Therefore the public zone is called "open".

The public distance is appropriate during official or religious ceremonies when the head of the state or church stands at a considerable distance from people.

2.4. Time management

Chronemics is the study of the use of time in non-verbal communication. The way we perceive time and react to time is a powerful communication tool, and helps set the stage for communication. Time perceptions include punctuality and willingness to wait, the speed of speech and how long people are willing to listen. The timing and frequency of an action as well as the tempo and rhythm of communications within an interaction contributes to the interpretation of non-verbal messages.

Perception and use of time is very different across cultures. One of criteria to define the attitude to time is the period of possible lateness. For example, if in the USA you are late for an important meeting, it is viewed as lack of interest in the matter and humiliation, while in Latin America it is normal to be 45 minutes late. Therefore, a meeting of North Americans and Latin Americans may fail just because the parties do not know peculiarities of each others' cultures.

Time perception, characteristic of a culture, divides cultures into polychronic and monochronic. (For more details see p. 124–125)

The *monochronic model* views time as a long road or a band, divided into segments. The representative of this culture believes that a person may be busy with only one activity at a time. The individual also divides time between business and emotions. In monochronic cultures, it is possible to be 10–15 minutes late and to offer feasible excuses.

The *polychronic model* presupposes no definite schedule. A person may deal with several problems at a time. Time in general is seen here as intersecting spiral trajectories or a circle. The extreme cases are cultures where there are no words referring to time (for instance, languages of North American Indians). Here, to be 40–60 minutes late is acceptable and does not require any excuses.

If monochronic cultures constantly keep time, believe that time is money, in polychronic cultures there is not such a need. The typical examples of polychronic cultures are Russian, Latin American, French.

It should be noted that cultures also make use of *formal* and *informal types of time*. Informal time is related with indefinite time reference: *in some time, later, in the afternoon*, etc. Formal time, on the contrary, is counted very exactly: *by 2 p.m., tomorrow at 15.30*, etc. Obstacles in cross-cultural communication occur mostly in situations when one communicator operates with formal time, while his/her counterpart – with informal. The former arrives to the meeting by 2 p.m., while the latter approximately in the afternoon, if he/she turns up at all.

Time management also concerns rhythm, dynamics and time count and cultures are not the only factor of influence here (e.g. in cities people walk along the streets more quickly than villagers).

2.5. Sensor language

Besides all other aspects of non-verbal communication, attitude to the partner is also formed with the use of senses. We maintain communication with the partner depending on our perception of his/her physique, height, weight, odour, hair and skin colour and clothing.

Research into height has generally found that taller people are perceived as being more impressive. Thus, a sample of managers in the UK revealed that height was a key factor affecting who was promoted (cf. offensive ethnonym *little people* to refer to the Chinese). The partner's weight also determines our perception of the personality. Thus, plump people are associated with such qualities as good-naturedness and generosity, while skinny people are said to be thrifty and stern.

Odours are particularly important. These are first of all smells of the partner's body and cosmetics. Interestingly, smells, ordinary in one culture, may be absolutely unacceptable in another culture, which can break communication.

Smells of traditional cuisine may be considered unusual and disgusting by foreigners. Cf.:

> The smell of boiled eggs is typical of American houses. Americans do not view the smell off-putting, but some Asians treat this smell just as repulsive as the stink of rotten fish: they do not eat boiled eggs and have no chance to get used to the smell.
>
> A European has to be very careful when tasting dishes of Indian or Indonesian cuisine due to great amount of spices, whereas Indians consider European cuisine tasteless.

Colour combinations, used in various cultures, also differ, we may not like some combinations and colours either for being to pale or too bright. Besides, one should bear in mind peculiarities of colour symbolism: the colour of mourning in one culture may be the colour of purity and joy in the other.

Acoustic preferences are also culturally specific. That is why music may be absolutely different. Sometimes, foreign tunes may sound incomprehensible, strange and unpleasant.

All sensor factors in combination create a sensor picture of a culture. Evaluation that we give depends on the proportion of pleasant and unpleasant sensor feelings. If pleasant feelings outweigh, we evaluate positively. If we experience more unpleasant feelings, we do not think highly of the culture.

3. Paraverbal means of communication

Paralanguage (sometimes called vocalics) is non-verbal cues of the voice. Various acoustic properties of speech such as voice quality, rate, rhythm, intonation, tone, pitch and accent, collectively known as prosody, can all give off non-verbal cues.

In communication, a word is never neutral. Paralanguage may change the meaning of words, since the meaning of an utterance may change with the help of intonation, rhythm, stresses – phrasal or logical (e.g. intonation in Ukrainian makes distinct interrogative and affirmative sentences; intonation may also convey sarcasm, disgust, humour, etc.).

Though individual characteristics of a voice may not be reliable indicators of the individual's personal qualities, still we perceive our partners taking into account their voice as well. Hearers tend to attribute people with perfect speech (nice timbre, intonations) with more merits. Such speakers are as a rule ascribed not only high intellectual and psychological potential (attractiveness, education, good nature) but also high professional skills (competence, reliability, confidence, etc.).

With the help of voice, one may express the main emotions – fear, anger, surprise – and emotional states – good will, anxiety, certainty, interest. For example, quick speech helps a person to come across as active and energetic, while a low voice usually characterizes a person of strong will, determination and resolution. A soft voice is seen as meaning "demureness" and "passivity" or "lack of confidence" and by extension "female".

As a rule, paraverbal means are divided into *prosodic* (speed, timbre, pitch and volume) and *extralinguistic* (pauses, coughs, sighs, laughter and crying (i.e. sounds we produce with the help of voice)).

Paraverbal devices may be strongly influenced by cultural peculiarities. For example, we may distinguish between quiet and loud cultures. Cf.:

> In Europe, Americans are disapproved because they speak too loudly. This quality stems from the fact that sociable Americans very often do not care whether their conversation is listened to by strangers. It is very important for them, though, to show that they are open and competent. Unlike Americans, English people follow a different logic: they believe one should not interfere with other people's matters. That is why they know how to direct their speech onto an intended recipient and take into account both noise (of the street, restaurant) and the distance. (Cf. a British linguist's comments: "American visitors to Britain...often seem unbearably confident to English people. This may be partly based on the confidence children are given by the American system of education. Perhaps there is much more space in the United States and probably British people seem rather too shy and retiring to Americans. I find that I feel people are cross with me when I first arrive in Spain because they generally seem to speak more loudly than English people." [Jeffries 1998, p. 52—53])

> In some Arab and African cultures, volume of speech regulates role change — speaker — listener. In European cultures, two people speaking loudly and simultaneously mean argument or quarrel.

Paradoxical as it may be, but silence is also important in communication. Different cultures tolerate silences to a different extent. Americans are thought to hate long pauses and try to fill them with speaking. That is why when foreign reporters or businesspeople go to the USA to get some information, they are taught to make long pauses – and Americans will fill the pauses with information.

Intonation is also important for CCC, since it is intonation that quite often defines the meaning. Cf.:

> European languages make use of contrast accent that marks important information. Speakers of South-Asian languages, vice versa, tend to say important information quieter than the already known.

Tempo is also culturally specific. Finns, for example, speak slowly, with long pauses. This peculiarity has created the stereotype of Finns as people who think slowly and act without hurry. In the culture of North American Indians, pauses several minutes long within a message are considered normal. Cultures that prefer quick speech are represented by speakers of the Romance languages (French, Romanians, Moldovans, Gypsies), who practically never stop for a pause.

Communication styles and non-verbal means are equally important in cross-cultural interactions. The following is an illustrative example of miscommunication that results from differences in communication styles and paraverbal means in English and in Finnish:

> Jaakko and Susan share an office in the Nokia headquarters in Espoo, Finland. Jaakko is a Finnish male, mid-30s and speaks fluent English despite never having lined in an English-speaking country. Susan is an American female, in her late

20s and living in Finland, who struggles to learn Finnish and is thus thankful that English is the working language at the company. They have been recently assigned to the same office and are still getting to know one another. One cold day as they were in their office with the window open, Jaakko says to Susan: "hey, shut the window" in the rather monotonous tone that is common for Finnish speakers as their native language lacks the pitch common to many other languages. Upon hearing this, Susan closes the window, but feels irritated by the way Jaakko "commanded" her to close the window without even having the courtesy to say "please"!

From Jaakko's point of view, he wanted the window to be closed and got what he wished for, using the direct language in order to accomplish his task. In Finnish, the request is neither polite nor rude, but would be used when people are more familiar with one another, so language formalities are dropped. As Finnish doesn't have the equivalent of "please", it is easily forgotten by Finns speaking English while adopting a varying intonation when speaking English is next to impossible for many Finnish speakers if not downright comical to mimic. Lastly, Finns tend to express requests briefly without necessarily detailing why they want an action to be carried out. If the circumstances make it obvious, stating the obvious is avoided.

Interpreted from American English filter, on the other hand, Susan clearly understood what Jaakko wanted, but his manner of saying it was what bothered her. "Please" is that short but sweet word that English speakers are taught from early on to use when making a request. If left out, what is asked can easily feel like an order, even when that is not what the person saying it intended. Additionally, and probably unconscious to most English speakers, is the impact that intonation has on communicating the tome of a request by softening it. Susan probably wanted to hear something like this: "Hey, Susan! Could you please close the window, it's a little chilly in here." [Gore 2007, p. 140–141]

Reading and assignments

1. *Read the abstract and answer the question below:*

… people didn't speak directly, it was vulgar. In the Mughal times, the pattern of conversation had been full of incredible politeness, delightfully archaic phrases that my father had often regaled me with. When the cultured Muslims went to enquire after a friend's health, they didn't rudely ask, "Are you unwell?" They would say, "I hear those who wish you ill, are unwell." [SALM, p. 8]

> • *Do modern European cultures resort to any "round-about" phrases in order to enquire or state some "touchy" things? If they do, get ready to give examples.*

2. *Read the following abstract and write a list of taboo topics in Ukrainian and some other cultures.*

It was an unwritten law of the Indian constitution… one did not discuss what was within these walls, whether it was to do with money or love. Obviously, I was delirious when I realized that middle-class English people thought nothing of discussing their most intimate details, called their mum and dad by their first names and, most horrifically and deliciously, wandered about the house in the nuddy! [SALM, p. 49]

…американцы не любят говорить на связанные с внешней политикой темы (…) в отличие от, например, немцев (...) Утверждается, что жители США вообще не склонны обсуждать серьезные, направленные на "поиск истины" темы…

Даже такая…культурно "прозрачная" тема, как *работа* обладает немалым потенциалом очуждения… На Востоке [восточные немцы – *I.A.*] постоянно говорят о работе, она является излюбленной темой и постоянным поводом для брюзжания (…). Для немца из ФРГ работа является чем-то, что делается быстро, ловко и умело. Работа – это источник успеха и денег, а не тема для приятного времяпрепровождения. В лучшем случае, задним числом можно упомянуть о выгодном гешефте, удачной сделке. Если возникли трудности на службе, о них признаются разве что

спутнику жизни (…) …западный человек запрограммирован на успех, он должен непрерывно казаться сильным и жестким, скрывать свои слабые места.

Немец едва ли будет жаловаться на то, что у него слишком много работы. Напротив, его энергия находит здесь сферу своего приложения и может исчерпать себя, а сам он использует работу в качестве возможности растратить силы и доказать свою ловкость и умелость. "Я смертельно устал", "я пашу как лошадь", "я задыхаюсь от работы" - формулировки такого рода редко можно услышать из уст немца. Если бы кто-то употребил их в разговоре с друзьями, коллегами или знакомыми, он наверняка натолкнулся бы на удивление, непонимание или даже неодобрение, так как человек, который не в состоянии справиться со своей работой и так ее организовать, чтобы она сохраняла для него человеческие и тем самым приемлемые рамки, может быть лишь "плохим" сотрудником или "неспособным" руководителем. [Донец 2001, с. 164–165]

3. *Read the abstract on Chinese key communicative features. Try to define how they relate to Ukrainian communicative tradition.*

Key features	Comments
Communication produces harmony	The chief aim of communication is to bring harmonious relationships rather than mainly to share information functionally.
Communication depends on authority	Communication follows tradition and authority rather than originality or spontaneity.
Communication depends on the known	Speakers say what is known rather than regard saying as a way of knowing.
Communication is inductive	Inductive patterns are often used – background first, main point later or reason then result, rather than vice versa.
Communication is holistic	Opposites may be part of a larger truth, so there is a tendency to think "both – and" rather than "either – or" as in binary thinking.

Communication is reciprocal	Both participants have responsibility for understanding. Not everything needs to be explicit – hearers/readers can work out implications.
Communication works by analogy	Proof can come from analogy, examples or indications rather than by explicit sequential links.
Silence is communication	Silence can be acceptable on ambiguous or sensitive topics. Silence can show solidarity and avoid embarrassment.

[Lixian, Cortazzi 1998, p. 114]

4. *Read the tips, given to Ukrainian businessmen in a business magazine. Think what information on gestures and body language you can add.*

У Західній Європі немає значення, яка рука використовується у невербальному спілкуванні – права чи ліва (тільки потискаючи руки, люди традиційно надають перевагу правій руці). На Близькому Сході, в будь-якій мусульманській країні, з руками слід бути обережними. Там досить ризиковано давати що-небудь (гроші, їжу чи подарунок) лівою рукою – вона вважається "нечистою" та має погану славу.

У багатьох країнах світу – Сполучених Штатах Америки, Великій Британії, в Україні – "нуль", складений великим та вказівним пальцями, означає: все добре, прекрасно, о'кей! Але в Японії традиційне значення цього жесту – "гроші", а в Німеччині та Португалії його сприймуть як щось непристойне.

Якщо людина виразно стукає себе пальцем по голові, то для нас це означає: не кажи дурниць, так думати може лише божевільний. Так само сприймуть цей жест французи, німці та італійці. Крім того, німцям, так само як і американцям, подобається малювати вказівним пальцем спіраль біля голови, що приблизно означає: дещо дивна думка! Але якщо себе по голові стукає британець чи іспанець, тоді всім зрозуміло: він надзвичайно задоволений собою – саме собою, а не ким-небудь іншим. Частка самоіронії в цьому жесті не змінює його сутності – людина хвалить саму себе: який я розумний!

Відомо, що найбільш експресивно жестикулюють французи. Вони – запеклі сперечальники й у суперечках занадто емоційні: їх темперамент проявляється не тільки у розмові, але й у жестах. Тому, спілкуючись із французом, будьте дуже уважні. Якщо він хоче виразити захоплення вишуканою картиною, стравою чи чим-небудь ще, то, з'єднавши три пальці, підносить їх до губів та, піднявши високо підборіддя, посилає повітряний поцілунок. А коли тре вказівним пальцем перенісся? Це – попередження: обережно, тут щось не те, цим людям не слід довіряти.

У різних країнах дуже багато значень має хитання пальця з боку в бік. У США, Італії та Фінляндії це може означати легкий осуд чи заклик дослухатися до того, про що говорять. У Нідерландах та Франції похитуванням пальця скріплюють остаточну відмову. Коли цим жестом потрібно виразити ще й осуд, то вказівним пальцем водять із боку в бік біля голови.

Якщо голандець стукає себе по лобу, піднявши вказівний палець догори, це свідчить про те, що він оцінив думку співрозмовника. Але коли цей палець спрямований не догори, а в бік, цей жест треба розуміти так: співрозмовник неадекватний. В арабських країнах ступні ніг, повернуті до іншої людини, чи піднятий догори великий палець розцінюються як прояв непристойної поведінки, а жестикулювання взагалі засуджується.

5. *Read the abstract and answer the questions below:*
…a group of students were preparing for an in-class presentation. The group consisted of two Anglo nurses and two nurses from Jamaica. As one Anglo nurse spoke, the non-verbal message of the Jamaican nurses included rolling of eyes, crossed arms, and occasional frowning and tense looks. The Anglo nurse appeared to pick up on this non-verbal communication and continued to talk, however, her rate of speech increased, she became very red in the face and only maintained eye contact with me. The students were ignoring the tension. Recognizing that there was a possible conflict, I asked the group to pause and reflect on what was happening in present and discuss the meaning of messages. This revealed that although both agreed as to what the non-verbal message meant (e.g. rolling of eyes, crossed arms, and frowns indicated frustration and anger, whereas rapid speech and blushing indicated

nervousness), there was not agreement on the intensity of the message. The message sent by the Jamaican nurses was overinterpreted by the Anglo nurse as signaling severe frustration and anger when in fact it was rated by the Jamaican nurses as mild. A discussion of cultural differences in expressiveness ensued resulting in an understanding that the conflict, in part, resulted from misinterpretation of the non-verbal message. As we continued to analyze the situation, the "I versus we" orientation (individualistic vs group centred) was discussed. The Jamaican nurses identified that their frustration began when the Anglo nurses continued to use the pronoun "I" as they discussed what the group project would be. The Jamaican nurses viewed this as competitive and individualistic with one person trying to take individual credit. The situation was further aggravated because the Anglo nurse shared with the group that she had a "surprise" ending for her presentation that she did not want her partners to know "because it would ruin the impact". This was perceived by the Jamaican nurses as trying to take all the credit and not willing to work in a group. Stepping back from the situation and discussing the interaction, the students were able to discuss the individual – vs – group orientation. The Anglo student was comfortable with preparing on her own and taking charge of assignments. She was not as comfortable discussing what her part of the presentation would be as part of a group negotiation. The Jamaican students were very comfortable in the group discussion and had much greater anxiety concerning their own individual presentations and gained support by discussing what should be involved in that presentation. A bicultural understanding was reached as the faculty reviewed the different value orientations and the students were assisted seeing the different behavioral expectations that they held because of these values. [Salmond 2000, p. 156–157]

- *The abstract describes the process of learning cultural differences and correcting communicators' behaviour in a class, whose purpose is to develop cross-cultural competence. What are the ways to remedy cross-cultural misunderstanding in everyday situations? (Note that in the abstract, tension was caused both by non-verbal and verbal behaviour of the participants.)*

6. *Look for some examples of colour symbolism in different cultures. Have you noticed any differences in colour preferences while travelling?*

7. *Read the following abstracts and answer the questions:*
…cultures have different perceptions of where the boundaries of the self are located. Americans and Northern Europeans think of themselves as being contained within their skin. The zone of privacy is extended to include the clothes that cover the skin and even a small space around the body. Any infringement of these areas is looked upon as invasion of privacy. But in the Arab culture the self is thought of as being located at a sort of central core.

Arabs tolerate crowding, noise levels, the touching of hands, the probing of eyes, the moisture of exhaled breath, and a miasma of body odors that would overwhelm a Westerner. The ultimate invasion of privacy to the Western mind – rape – does not even have a lexical equivalent in Arabic. [Moraine 1998, p. 73]

When a German seeks reclusion, he hides behind the locked door, while an Arab plunges into his self.

- *What are the intimate and personal zones for Ukrainians?*
- *Does the extent of the personal zone depend on culture alone? Are there any other factors that influence it?*

8. *Read the abstract from Wierzbicka's book* Meaning and Culture. *Summarize the content of the abstract. Think of other peculiarities of 'Anglo' communication as well as of communication styles typical of cultures you are familiar with. Get ready to provide examples.*

The Anglo Ideal of "Accuracy" and the Practice of "Understatement"

Abraham Rihbany, the author of a 1920 book entitled *The Syrian Christ* (an attempt at explaining some aspects of the Gospels by placing them in their cultural context), emigrated from Syria to the United States as a young man. Having lived for many years in America, he became acutely aware of many differences between AngloAmerican and "Syrian" (Middle Eastern) ways of speaking and

between the cultural values reflected in them. On a visit to his home-land, he realized that over the years he had become bicultural: he still understood the Syrian cultural scripts, but in his own speech, he tended to follow the Anglo scripts. (Rihbany uses the term *Syrian* in the older sense of the word, modeled on the Arabic *Sham*, which, as Hopwood (1988, 1) says, is the name "for the region in the eastern Mediterranean between Egypt and Turkey.") Thus, Rihbany wrote:

While on a visit to Syria, after having spent several years in the West, I was very strongly impressed by the decidedly sharp contrast between the Syrian and the Anglo-Saxon modes of thought. The years had worked many changes in me, and I had become addicted to the more compact phraseology of the Western social code. In welcoming me to his house, an old friend of mine spoke with impressive cheerfulness as follows: "You have extremely honoured me by coming into my abode [*menzel*]. I am not worthy of it. This house is yours; you can burn it if you wish. My children are also at your disposal; I would sacrifice them all for your pleasure. What a blessed day this is, now that the light of your countenance has shone upon us"; and so forth, and so on. I understood my friend fully and most agreeably, although it was not easy for me to translate his words to my American wife without causing her to be greatly alarmed at the possibility that the house would be set on fire and the children slain for our pleasure. What my friend really meant in his effusive welcome was no more or less than what gracious host means when he says, "I am delighted to see you, please make yourself at home." (Rihbany 1920, 89)

In this passage, trying to analyze his experience, Rihbany links Anglo culture with the use of "compact phraseology" and the Syrian culture with "effusiveness." The term *effusiveness* (and also *impetuosity*) appears again in the following passage:

The Oriental's impetuosity and effusiveness make his imprecatory prayers, especially to the "unaccustomed ears" of Englishmen, blood-curdling. And I confess that on my last visit to Syria, my countrymen's (and especially my countrywomen's) bursts of pious wrath jarred heavily upon me. In his oral bombardment of his enemy the Oriental hurls such missiles as, "May God burn the bones of your fathers"; "May God exterminate you from the earth"; "May God cut off your supply of bread (*yakta rizkak*)"; "May you have nothing but the ground for a bed and the sky for covering"; "May your children be orphaned and your wife widowed"; and similar expressions. (Rihbany 1920, 65)

Rihbany explains that to understand such outbursts, it is essential to realize that the speakers do not mean what they say and that Anglo norms differ from Middle Eastern norms concerning saying what one means: "It is unpleasant to an Anglo-Saxon to note how many things an Oriental says, but does not mean. And it is distressing to an Oriental to note how many things the Anglo-Saxon means, but does not say" (p. 77). In addition to compactness, conciseness, and brevity as putative Anglo values, Rihbany often speaks of the Anglo value of accuracy—from a Syrian cultural point of view, not a positive, but an irritant:

To an unreconstructed Syrian the brevity, yes, even curtness, of an Englishman or an American, seems to sap life of its pleasures and to place a disproportionate value on time. For the Oriental, the primary value of time must not be computed in terms of business and money, but in terms of sociability and good fellowship. Poetry, and not prosaic accuracy, must be the dominant feature of speech. (Rihbany 1920, 77)

Explaining, and defending, the value of *in*accuracy in Middle Eastern speech (in contrast to prosaic, pedantic, pedestrian and dull accuracy), Rihbany writes:

There is much more of intellectual inaccuracy than of moral delinquency in the Easterner's speech. His misstatements are more often the result of indifference than the deliberate purpose to deceive. . . . He sees no essential difference between nine o'clock and half after nine, or whether a conversation took place on the housetop or in the house. The main thing is to know the substance of what happened, with as many of the supporting details as may be conveniently remembered. A case may be overstated or understated, not necessarily for the purpose of deceiving, but to impress the hearer with the significance or the insignificance of it. If a sleeper who had been expected to rise at sunrise should oversleep and need to be awakened, say half an hour or an hour later than the appointed time, he is then aroused with the call, "Arise, it is noon already—qim sar edh-hir." Of a strong man it is said, "He can split the earth—yekkid elaridh." The Syrians suffer from no misunderstanding in such cases. They discern one another's meaning.(Rihbany 1920, 77—78)

Although Rihbany says in this passage that "a case may be overstated or understated," in fact in both cases he means an exaggeration: for example, saying *all* when one means *many* or saying *none* when one means *few*. In his experience, from an Anglo point of

view, to say *all* when one means *many* or to say *none* when one means *few* is a sin, whereas from a Syrian point of view, it is a virtue.

Rihbany himself often speaks in this connection of "exaggeration" as a feature of what he calls "Oriental speech" and as something that Anglo culture, with its emphasis on accuracy, abhors: "Just as the Oriental loves to flavour his food strongly and to dress in bright colours, so is he fond of metaphor, exaggeration, and positiveness in speech. To him mild accuracy is weakness." Rihbany links Anglo culture's taste for 'accuracy' and distaste for 'exaggeration' with the value of "correctness." For example, he writes:

Again, let me say that an Oriental expects to be judged chiefly by what he means and not by what he says. As a rule, the Oriental is not altogether unaware of the fact that, as regards the letter, his statements are often sadly lacking in correctness. But I venture to say that when a person who is conversing with me knows that I know that what he is saying is not exactly true, I may not like his manner of speech, yet I cannot justly call him a liar. (Rihbany 1920, 88)

It is interesting to note the use of the word *sadly* in this passage: "Oriental statements" are said to be "sadly lacking in correctness." The word *sadly* reflects here, of course, an Anglo perspective: as Rihbany emphasizes again and again, from a Syrian point of view, there is nothing sad or inappropriate about such absence of literal correctness and accuracy—quite the contrary.

What exactly does the Anglo ideal of accuracy, as intuited in Rihbany's bilingual and bicultural experience, really mean? … I suggest that it means, in essence, a match between what a person wants to say with some words, and what these words actually say: ideally, the words as such should bear exactly the meaning that the person wants to convey with these words.

But this is only a first approximation. First of all, if accepted as it is stated, the script just sketched would rule out metaphorical language: a metaphor implies … that the words themselves do not mean what the speaker wants to say with these words. Because the ideal of accuracy is not incompatible with the use of metaphors, this script should be revised, in the first instance, along the following lines: the words that a person says should say *no more and no less* than what this person wants to convey with these words; if they are metaphorical, they can

say "something else," but if they are not metaphorical, they should say "no more and no less" than what the speaker wants to say.

If, however, the cultural ideal in question is aimed, primarily, at avoiding exaggeration, then the primary concern is that the words as such should *not say more* than the person wants to say with these words. It is not so much a question of "no more and no less" as of "no more." If one says *all* when one means *many*, this can be seen as a situation where the words say *more* than the person wants to say; if one says *none* when one means *few*, this, too, can be interpreted as a situation where the words say *more* than what the person wants to say. Given the Anglo practice of "understatement" (…), the concern is that one should not exaggerate rather than that one should say strictly "no more and no less than what one wants to say." Rihbany is quite insightful in this regard (as he is in many others) when he says that "it is distressing to an Oriental to note how many things the Anglo-Saxon means but does not say" (Rihbany 1920, 77). This is largely what "understatement" as an Anglo speech practice is all about: expressing oneself in such a way that one's words say less than what one wants to say with these words. What is seen as important is that people should not *over*state—that is, should not exaggerate—rather than they should not *under*state what they really want to communicate.

Native speakers of English, including linguists, seldom seem to be aware of the extent to which English is perceived by cultural outsiders as the language of understatement. To quote one characteristic example—a comment on English Anglo culture by the German commentator H. Butow:

Everything is in the style of *understatements* [the English word is used here in the German original, A.W.], of downtoning, which the English conversation has over many generations brought to mastery. *Understatement* [again, in English, A.W.]— this is not only the opposite of what we call "Angabe" ["a full statement," A.W.], it is in England almost a worldview [*Weltanschauung*]. (Butow 1961, 171)

In a similar vein, the Hungarian British writer, social commentator, and satirist George Mikes (1946) described "understatements" as a feature distinguishing native English speakers from foreigners (Huebler 1983, 2).

Comments of this kind could easily be dismissed as shallow stereotyping, were they not widely perceived as valid and useful by

teachers of English as a nonnative language. For example, writing from a German perspective, Huebler comments:

Anyone progressing beyond the rudiments of learning English, certainly in Germany, soon finds that understatements are said to be typically English. Even someone who has not been exposed to English, if he has studied German literature at school, will come across the English word understatement as a literary term. The very fact that it is the English word understatement and not the German word Untertreibung that is used suggests a special affinity with the English way of life. Attributing understatements to a predominantly English linguistic pattern of behaviour is documented in many works dealing with the English way of life. Amongst such books are those aimed specifically at teaching English as a foreign language. (Huebler 1983, 1)

Of course, it has often been pointed out that "understatement" is more characteristic of British English than it is of American English (and in Australia, it is often perceived as a feature of British English *distinguishing* it from Australian English). No doubt there is some truth in that, too. Nonetheless, downtoners, diminishers, minimizers, and deintensifiers of many kinds (to be discussed shortly) belong to the linguistic resources available to, and used by, speakers of American and Australian English, too.

Huebler (1983, 73) offers the following list of expressions commonly used in modern English as tools for understatement or downtoning (the labels are his; see also Quirk et al. 1972, 452):

compromisers:
comparatively, enough, kind of, more or less, quite, rather, relatively, sort of
diminishers:
a little, in many/some respects, in part, mildly, moderately, partially, partly, pretty, slightly, somewhat
minimizers:
a bit, barely, hardly, scarcely
approximators:
almost, basically, nearly, practically, technically, virtually

From a cross-linguistic perspective, it would be difficult not to admit that this list is very (or should I say, rather) extensive indeed. Furthermore, this wealth of downtoners is a relatively recent (roughly, post-seventeenth-century) development in English…

Where does the ideal of 'accuracy' or 'nonexaggeration' reflected in this wealth of 'downtoners' come from? To quote Rihbany again:

"A Syrian's chief purpose in a conversation is to convey an impression by whatever suitable means, and not to deliver his message in scientifically accurate terms. He expects to be judged not by what he *says,* but by what he *means*" (1920, 81).

The key word here is *scientifically*: given the central role of science in modern Anglo culture, it is understandable that scientific discourse has become in this culture, for many intents and purposes, the model of "good speech": rational, dispassionate, factually based, precise, and accurate.

One proviso, however, is needed: this is how one should speak about "things." When one speaks about people rather than things, other considerations come into play, and other scripts apply— scripts that may be alien to scientific discourse, which is about things, not people. When one speaks about people, 'tact' may be more important than strict accuracy. When one speaks about things, however, it is good to speak objectively, without undue emotion, without exaggeration, with care, with due caution, with precision, distinguishing facts from opinions, stating facts accurately, qualifying one's statements according to the strength of one's evidence, and so on. I discuss a number of these values in the subsequent sections of this chapter. Here, let me try to formulate, on the basis of the discussion so far, the cultural script for 'accuracy' and 'nonexaggeration'. I phrase these scripts in terms of certain prototypes:

the Anglo script for 'accuracy' and 'nonexaggeration'
[people think like this:]
sometimes people say words like *all*
when they want to say something like *many*
sometimes people say words like *many*
when they want to say something like *some*
sometimes people say words like *none*
when they want to say something like *not many*
it is not good to speak like this [i.e., to say things in this way] [Wierzbicka 2006, p. 25–30]

CHAPTER VII
Perception and Understanding
in Cross-Cultural Communication

1. Perception
in cross-cultural communication

Perception as process

The individual's world perception is determined by many factors: upbringing, social environment, education, temper, worldview, personal experience, etc. All these factors form a complex system used to perceive information, analyze it and form a corresponding pattern of behaviour.

Communication begins with watching the partner's appearance, voice, manners, etc. All these observations are actually perception, that is, a selective choice, organization and interpretation of sensor data. This is an obligatory starting part of communication called *perceptive aspect of communication*. The term "perceptive" stands here not only for "perception" but also for "cognition". Perception of the partner means "reading" his/her, i.e. decoding his/her inner world and individual qualities on the ground of external (mainly non-verbal and paraverbal) peculiarities. The individual first evaluates the partner emotionally, tries to understand the partner's logic and, on the basis of these observations, builds communicative strategies. Thus, information we get watching other people is attributed some meaning, i.e. the observations are interpreted. For example, a phone ring we hear is only a ring, but the meaning we ascribe to the ring is our interpretation. Thus, an unexpected call at three in the morning will most certainly mean

some alarming signal of an extraordinary event, while a phone call during the day is viewed as normal, everyday situation.

Perception presupposes reflection of objects, situations and events in human mind. As a result, perception and interpretation of objects, situations and events are not free from our emotions and motivations. Thus, we tend to view people similar to ourselves more positively than those who are different. The same attitude is observed concerning those acquaintances who resemble people we used to be close with. As a rule, interpretation and structuring of information are based on the previous experience.

We should stress that human perception is selective. Cultural and life experience, emotions, upbringing, education are specific and unique for every person, that is why everyone grants events with a unique interpretation. Getting new information, a person structures and organizes it in a convenient way. This means distributing perceived things, people, relations, events and phenomena into corresponding groups, classes, types, i.e. categories. In psychology, this process is called "categorization".

Categorization helps to simplify the world, to make it more comprehensible and accessible, to deal with the enormous flow of information about people, phenomena, and events. Besides, with the help of categorization, we may predict, structure and establish relations. If the individual categorizes a certain sphere, he/she then groups all things from this sphere (category) on the ground of their common qualities and ignores their differences. A category, once created and used in practice, will then constantly influence the individual's perception of people in general.

Categorization is a necessary element of world perception. If categories have already been formed, we take them for granted and see borderlines between them as "normal". Meanwhile, rigid categories complicate adequate perception and cause problems in interpersonal communication. However, if an event cannot be categorized, it arouses anxiety or even fear, since it causes uncertainty. Consequently, to deal with the world effectively, one needs "flexible" categories.

World perception is determined by cultural, social and personal factors. Out of a huge range of factors, experts usually distinguish the four main ones: *the factor of first impression, the factor of social*

status, the factor of attractiveness and *the factor of attitude*. We will consider them one by one.

1) Factor of the first impression

Research on forming first impressions reveals some interesting points. We use a variety of cues to determine how we feel about other people, but among them, it seems that physical appearance and vocal attractiveness play a major role. These findings do not imply that a person has to be good-looking and possess a socially attractive voice (e.g. a deep voice for a male), because these can vary among cultures. What first impressions do illustrate is that non-verbal communication is important; we formulate an opinion about others quickly (some research suggests in less than 10 seconds) and that opinion lasts long and resists change. Furthermore, it reinforces a fact about human communication: *we cannot NOT communicate*, that is, we communicate all the time whether we want or not or whether we are aware of it or not.

Scientists believe that the character, the form and the style of communication depend in many respects on the first minutes or even seconds. There are a lot of simple devices that facilitate the initial stage of communication, which determines its further continuation. These devices are a smile, addressing the communicator by name, a compliment, etc. Well-known ways, often unconsciously used in everyday practice, help to win a partner's favour and lay the foundation for long-term and effective communication.

The first impression factor is very important, since the partner's image, formed right at the beginning of the conversation, regulates the subsequent actions. Firstly, the attention is drawn to those characteristics that help to refer the partner to a certain group.

The first impression is based on the assessment of the partner's appearance. Clothes may say particularly much. Each culture has models of clothes informing of social status of a person (e.g. expensive suit or uniform), sometimes clothes can inform of events in a person's life (e.g. wedding, funeral). The uniform points at the person's profession. For example, the presence of a person in the police uniform may stop people from fighting. Clothes may help to stand out or get lost in a crowd. Therefore, knowing these

tricks, the individual can create a certain image, enhance his/her status, prove his/her importance.

Clothes convey information on the social status. Thus, Creole women in Jamaica use scarves to inform of their marital status. If a woman shows only one corner of the head scarf, it means she is single, two corners mean she is engaged, three – married, four – she is divorced or widowed. Women from the Samoa Island send similar messages with flowers which they put either behind their right or left ear.

In non-verbal communication, of great importance are colours of the clothes and manners. Both spheres present a wide range of possible cultural variations (e.g. Germans and Russians are different in that Germans prefer brown, yellow and beige colours. As to manners, Russians are often surprised at the habit of Germans to enter the house or even to lie on a sofa without taking off their shoes.)

It is important to understand whether the first impression is right or fallacious. Studies show that almost any adult person with sufficient life experience is able to distinguish nearly all characteristics of the partner – his/her psychological features, socio-demographic status, etc. But the correctness is high only in neutral circumstances, i.e. in situations with artificially removed external influences. In real life situations there is always a certain percentage of mistakes.

2) Factor of social status

In long-term communication, it is important to perceive the partner deeply and objectively. It is then when the partner's social status comes into play. Research shows that to define this parameter, two sources of information are used:

- *clothes* including glasses, hairstyle, medals, jewelry, etc.;
- *manners* (the way the individual walks, sits, speaks and looks).

Clothes and manners indeed convey information on the partner's social group or his/her orientation to a certain group. Various elements of clothes and behaviour are attributes of a group. Adequate interpretation of these signs facilitates communication.

In China, informal relations are viewed essential. You may be asked of your age, marital status, children, which is to be understood as sincere interest. That is why you may be asked to dine out and offered no fewer than 20 dishes. Do not refuse to taste any of the dishes at least a bit. A traditional signal that the dinner is over is soup. After the soup, a guest is expected to stand up first and leave.

China is actually the most ceremonious country in Asia: Chinese like toasts but do not clink glasses. If they do clink, they follow the following rule: the younger person should clink the upper part of the glass against the glass stem of the elder person, showing that he is inferior. A person that pours drinks into glasses should fill them up to the brim, otherwise he allegedly expresses disrespect.

As to clothes, for example, up to the 20th century, a robe was the most popular clothes in China, and social status was encoded in its colour. Thus, a yellow robe could be worn only by the emperor, brown and white robes — only by senior state officials, red and blue — by heroes, students wore light blue robes, peasants — white, poor people — black.

Clothes, even today, remain an indicator of social status. We may speak of a sign system of clothes. Here, the most important factors are price, style (the higher the status the stricter, more reserved is the style), and colour (differs across cultures). All these peculiarities are unconsciously registered and influence the status we grant the person. Consequently, we expect the relationship of superiority or equality in communication.

These relations are also influenced by the partners' behaviour. Everyone may define whether relations are equal or unequal: superiority is, as a rule, demonstrated with the help of supercilious air, arrogance, self-confidence, etc. Superior attitude may be shown with trifles: with a relaxed pose, a look out of the window or at the nails. Sometimes the communicator on purpose speaks incomprehensibly, uses many special terms, foreign words, i.e. does not seek to be understood, which is perceived as intellectual superiority.

The factor of social status is frequently observed in cross-cultural communication. A foreigner often gets caught in a situation which he/she does not understand and feels certain dependence on the partner. If it is the case, natives, familiar with the rules of the situation, are the masters, they will behave confidently, independently and, consequently, demonstrate superiority in behaviour.

3) The factor of attractiveness

Out of all people with whom we communicate, we tend to like some while we like less the others as well as there are those that do not arouse in us any emotions. And quite often our preferences have nothing to do with people's physical characteristics. A person's attractiveness to other people results from a wide range of factors that may be divided into internal and external.

The *external factors of attraction*, i.e. factors, not connected with the process of interaction, are the following:

- strong need of affiliation;
- partners' emotional state;
- special closeness between the partners.

The *need of affiliation* is a need to create and maintain satisfactory relations with other people, willingness to be liked, to draw attention, interest, to feel oneself a valuable and important personality. The individual with weak need of affiliation produces an impression of a person that avoids people. The individual whose need of affiliation is strongly expressed, constantly seeks contacts with others, tries to get closer with people, tries to make himself/herself noticed.

Emotional state. Experiments have shown that a person experiencing positive emotions looks at other people more often than a person in a neutral, aggressive or depressed state. The individual going through negative emotions either does not see others or projects his/her negative emotions onto them. Thus, the way the individual treats other people and the way they treat him/her form the general emotional state which influences the communication process.

Special closeness. The closer people live/study/work, the more attractive they seem to each other. This factor plays the main role in interpersonal relations. For example, in childhood, the circle of

friends is formed first of all of peers, living close to each other, as well as of classmates.

Special closeness influences the duration of a relationship as well. A huge number of friendships, love affairs are terminated due to distance. The saying "out of sight out of mind" is mostly true because it points out the difficulties in maintaining relations at a distance. Relations that survive despite the distance are rare because one has to take much effort to maintain them.

Special closeness is typical of neighbours first of all because people, living next to each other, share the same environment, use the same social structure, the same cultural values. As a result they have the same problems, which facilitates their communication and interaction. This is where their close relations stem from.

The factors above are determined from outside, since they are situational conditions that facilitate or hinder communication. Still, as soon as people start communicating, there is a new group of factors that come into play, i.e. factors created by the communication process itself. This group of attractiveness factors is called internal.

Internal, or, in fact, *interpersonal factors* are:

- partners' physical attractiveness;
- communication style;
- cognitive similarity between communicators.

Physical attractiveness. Human psyche perceives beauty as important element in interpersonal relations. This factor is influential from the age of four, when the individual's beauty provides him/her greater popularity compared to other peers.

Research into correlation between beauty and communicative ability shows that attractive people demonstrate more developed communication skills which is explained by different conditions of socialization of attractive and unattractive people. Here, we have to deal with the association "attractive means good", since people usually associate beauty with positive personal qualities and lack of beauty – with negative ones.

Meanwhile, it has been found out that a higher level of physical attractiveness does not provide stable success in long-term relations: the

influence of attractive appearance is usually felt more at the beginning of communication and diminishes as partners reveal their qualities.

It should be noted that physical attractiveness has social nature, since it is society that regards certain physical parameters as attractive. Every people has its own, different from others', beauty models and socially approved or disapproved types of appearance. In this respect, attractiveness is nothing but the degree of one's correspondence to a certain model, most appreciated in the society.

> Jung, while visiting the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, re-tells an Indian chief's views of the white man: "See how cruel the whites look. Their lips are thin, their noses are sharp, their faces furrowed and distorted by folds. Their eyes have a staring expression; they are always seeking something..."

Thus, attractiveness is determined by the socially endorsed type and efforts taken to correspond to it. At first sight, the statement of the kind seems absurd, since appearance is given by nature and is hardly liable to change. Yet, a fat man who is happy to be fat is assessed in a different way compared to a fat man who tries to look slim. Here, the sign of attractiveness is efforts taken to achieve the model characteristics.

Communication style is an important factor of interpersonal attraction. Everyone seems to enjoy communication with some people more than with others. Those who express generosity, resolution, tenderness, are liked more than those who are perceived as thrifty, cold, unemotional or shy.

Communication studies distinguish between *supportive* and *unsupportive styles* of communication. The *supportive style* may be defined as a behaviour pattern that helps the partner to enhance his/her self-esteem. These are the features peculiar to the supportive style:

- address by name that shows attention to a person;
- compliments;
- expression of a sincere consent with the partner;

- expression of positive emotions, i.e. a partner expresses verbally or non-verbally positive emotions that appear during a conversation;
- expression of gratitude.

The *unsupportive behaviour* is a pattern that makes the partner feel inferior or worse than at the beginning of a conversation. This style is characterized by:

- avoiding of discussion, i.e. the partner tries to change the subject;
- impersonal sentences – pronouncedly correct speech with implied refusal from personal communication;
- interruption of the partner;
- contradiction between verbal and non-verbal content of communication.

Cognitive similarity. This factor is based on the principle of cognitive concord, according to which a nice person is an individual who agrees with you. The principle of cognitive concord presupposes that people psychologically seek harmony. The individual's socio-cultural expectations, feelings, and values are interrelated and it brings a relative balance and stability into life. Therefore, the individual tries to maintain this concord or restore it if it is broken.

The importance of interpersonal attraction factors has been confirmed by the speech acts theory. According to the theory, interpersonal communication is one of the means which help the individual to maintain the state of cognitive balance, or symmetry. The simplest speech act may be represented as a situation where one person informs the other person of some qualities of an object. If the communicators have similar views and feelings about the object, their relations are symmetric. If their views and feelings differ, their relations are asymmetric. People with similar value systems feel mutual attraction. The more similar the systems are, the stronger the feeling of importance of their views is. Tension, caused by discrepancy of views, creates discomfort which the person tries to get rid of by means of adjusting to the partner's behaviour.

In general, common goals make people closer, but at times, similarity may diminish interpersonal attraction. In situations of

competition, two people with the same goals often treat each other in a negative way. Two men seeking a woman's attention will hardly make friends. Or two women claiming the same position at work will hardly like each other. That is why similarity of views is not a sufficient condition for mutual attraction and successful communication.

Thus, interpersonal attraction is determined by a number of factors. Positive perception of the partner may depend on the emotional state of the perceiver, on the need of affiliation, on the distance between the communicators. People are more likely to fall for those who share their views, education, values, status, for those whose behaviour and communicative style enhance their self-esteem and dignity.

4) Factor of attitude

It goes without saying that in communication the partner's attitude is very important: people who like us and treat us well seem much better than those who treat us badly. The attitude factor is expressed in communication as sympathy or dislike, agreement or disagreement with our viewpoint.

Attraction is formed in response to positive actions while dislike results from negative actions. The individual treats positively people who praise, love, co-operate with him/her, and vice versa, the individual treats negatively those who criticize, hate or compete with him/her. Psychologists have found that emotional reaction to positive actions is determined not so much by actions themselves, but rather by their interpretation, by motives ascribed to them, by the meaning attributed to them. Here, it is important whether the person perceives these actions as addressed to him/her personally or as impersonal, common behaviour in a certain situation. Meanwhile, excessive compliments and praise give rise to wondering whether the speaker is sincere and what motivates him/her to behave like this.

The effect of these factors never stops in the process of perception, though the role and importance of each of them in a certain situation may differ. Therefore perception of the same phenomena is always specific. As a result, the individual's world perception is selective. The major factor that controls selection is the degree of importance attributed by the perceiver to a certain aspect.

2. Culture and perception

> Мы заполняем физические очертания существа, которое видим, всеми идеями, которые мы уже выстроили о нем, и в окончательном образе его, который мы создаем в своем уме, эти идеи, конечно, занимают главное место. В конце концов они так плотно прилегают к очертаниям его щек, так точно следуют изгибам его носа, так гармонично сочетаются со звуком его голоса, что все это кажется не более чем прозрачной оболочкой, так что каждый раз, когда мы видим лицо или слышим голос, мы узнаем в нем ничто иное, как наши собственные идеи. (Пруст, цит. з [Ялом 2007, с. 190–191]

The world is perceived actively, and perception is determined by outlook, beliefs, cultural values and stereotypes. In the process of perceiving, the individual forms a simplified model of reality that helps him/her to orient in the complex reality: our deeds are to a certain extent determined by what we think of the world rather than what it really is. In this sense, humans are slaves of their own perception.

> Compare how researchers see the cognitive aspect of second language acquisition: "…through exposure to the language and cultural concepts of another society [society of second language speakers — *I.A.*] learners acquire new or modified schemata through which they understand the world. Every person born into a society has built up systems of perception and interpretation which are grounded in their native context, and which, being unconscious and non-verbalized, escape their control and interfere with their perception of other cultural systems." [Byram, Cain 1998, p. 35—36]

Interacting with each other, people of different cultures ground their opinions on different perceptive experience. Still, the physical mechanism of perception is shared by all humans but identification and interpretation of feelings is determined by culture.

It does not mean that all representatives of a culture are absolutely similar in their world perception: within a culture we may find a spectrum of differences. But the culture determines our subjective reality and is reflected in perception and behaviour, since behaviour is a person's reaction to the world and this reaction is culture bound.

> A vivid example of the role cultures play in perception may be an American teacher's experience. She went to work in Australia with children of Australian aboriginals. During a break the teacher suggested playing a game, where a child is placed in the centre of a circle with eyes tied and he/she must guess which of other players has touched him/her. Guessing should be made without blinds on the eyes. The children of Australian hunters could not understand the point of the game, as, seeing footprints on the sand, they easily learned who touched them. During a class following this game, the teacher was surprised that the children wouldn't listen to her explanations and learn the alphabet. Later on she understood that the children considered her stupid and decided, quite naturally, that she could hardly teach them anything worthy.

As it has already been stated, a great number of gestures, sounds and actions are, on the whole, interpreted by representatives of different cultures in different ways.

All in all, culture determines the person's interpretation of a certain fact, i.e. culture provides a person with a certain direction in world perception and it influences interpretation and assessment of information (e.g. we rather meticulously see differences within our cultural group, while representatives of other cultures often seem identical with each other. Thus, for Russians, all people from the Caucasus seem almost the same (consider the Russian collocation "лицо кавказской национальности")).

Another cultural determinant that influences perception is language. There have appeared two points of view – nominalist and relativist (for more details see p. 90–91).

3. Attribution in cross-cultural communication

3.1. Notion of attribution

In CCC, the person perceives the partner together with the partner's actions and through the actions. Adequacy of interpretations, given to the actions and their reasons, determines the interaction with other people and, in the long run, – success in communication. Quite often, the reasons and processes influencing the other person's behaviour remain covert and inaccessible. Since the information available is often not enough, the individuals start ascribing reasons for their partners' behaviour rather than looking for true ones. That is why attempts to form ideas of other people and to explain their behaviour without sufficient information end up in "attributing" reasons that seem to be typical of the individual. This process is based on the individual's behaviour in an analogous situation. Psychological studies into these mechanisms have resulted in formation of an independent branch in social psychology – *the theory of causal attribution* which explains how reasons for social conduct are determined. The term was first proposed by Fritz Heider in *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations* (1958) and was further developed by others such as Harold Kelley and Bernard Weiner.

Attribution is defined as a process of interpretation that helps the individual to ascribe certain reasons to events or actions. Interpretation takes place, first of all, when the partner's behaviour does not fit the individual's logic or familiar patterns.

Heider, the pioneer in the attribution theory, considers the observer's naïve analysis of others' behaviour. According to Heider, the "naïve observer" ascribes the leading role to one of the factors – personal qualities or circumstances – in order to explain others' actions. The naïve observer's conclusion tends to be reduced to the statement that "others are like that" (responsibility is ascribed) or "circumstances are such" (the action results from circumstances). Thus, according to Heider, the observer, having only information about the content of an action, may explain the action either with the help of the partner's personal traits, or external in-

fluence. The scholar claims that construction of attributions is related with the desire to simplify the surrounding and the attempt to predict other people's behaviour. Attribution, thus, performs an important function – attributions make events and phenomena predictable, controllable and understandable.

A different explanation of attribution has been suggested by Harold Kelley [Kelley 1967]. In his opinion, information about any action is assessed along the three lines: concord, stability and differentiation. *Concord* means the degree of uniqueness of an action from the point of view of social conventions. Low concord presupposes unique behaviour, while high concord implies habitual nature of an action. *Stability* means a degree of changeability of reactions peculiar to a person in common situations. High stability implies that the person behaves in a similar way, while low stability presupposes that an action is unique in the given circumstances (the person performs the action only today). *Differentiation* stands for a degree of uniqueness of an action in respect to this object. Low differentiation means that the person behaves in a similar way in other situations as well. High differentiation implies a unique combination of the reaction and the situation.

According to Kelley, various combinations of high and low indicators of these factors determine reasons for an action either as personal peculiarities (personal attribution) or as peculiarities of an object (stimulus attribution) or as peculiarities of a situation (circumstantial attribution). In case of *personal attribution*, the individual's behaviour is analyzed from the point of view of its uniqueness or conventionality, i.e. how much the individual's behaviour is typical of other people. If we deal with *stimulus attribution*, we have to answer the question whether the individual behaves similarly or differently with different people or things; whether the behaviour depends on the object of an action or its peculiarities. *Circumstantial attribution* determines correlation between the individual's behaviour and a situation.

Thus, every communicator, assessing others, tries to form a system of the partner's interpretation. In everyday life, people, as a rule, do not know true reasons for other people's behaviour or know them insufficiently. Research shows that every person has his/her personal explanations of other people's actions. Thus, some people tend to *personal attribution*. These people are inclined to appoint scapegoats

anyone but not themselves in any situation. Others apply *circumstantial attribution*, i.e. they blame circumstances without trying to find a true culprit. And finally, others make use of *stimulus attribution*: a person sees the reason in an object of an action or the victim (e.g. a schoolchild's success at an exam may be ascribed either to the child's intellectual abilities, diligence and industriousness or to easy questions in a card or to the fact that he/she managed to cheat).

3.2. Attribution bias and errors

The attribution models, discussed above, presuppose a complicated analysis of diverse information about a person's behaviour. Meanwhile, one often lacks either information or time for analysis. In everyday life, the individual is not usually sufficiently informed of other people's reasons. If it is the case, the person starts to ascribe reasons to other people's actions in order to provide them with rational explanations. The person creates a system of attribution which quite often leads to subjective, fallacious conclusions.

There may be distinguished two causes of fallacious subjective attributions:

    1) discrepancy between information and the individual's position;
    2) discrepancy in motivation.

Indeed, attribution is grounded on the observer's viewpoint of the situation. Obviously, any situation looks differently "inside" from "outside", therefore we may say that actors see the situation differently from observers. Accordingly, attribution of a doer and attribution of an observer are different. For example, when a normally nice waiter is being rude to his customer, the customer will assume, just by looking at the attitude that the waiter is giving him, instantly decides that the waiter is a bad person. The customer oversimplifies the situation by not taking into account all the unfortunate events that might have happened to the waiter which made him rude at the moment. Therefore, the customer made ***dispositional attribution*** by attributing the waiter's behaviour directly to his personality rather than considering situational factors that might have caused the "rudeness".

Informational discrepancies between the observer and the doer lie in the volume of knowledge about an action: the doer is informed of the causes more than the observer. The doer is also aware of desires, motives, expectations of the action, while the observer does not, as a rule, have this information. As a result, the observer is inclined to constantly overestimate personal abilities, the role of disposition in the doer's behaviour. The *fundamental attribution error* is a cognitive bias in which people put too much emphasis on internal, dispositional factors in explaining people's behaviours rather than explaining them in terms of situational factors. In other words, people believe an action was done because of the actor's personality rather than the situation faced by the actor.

Culture bias. Research shows that culture, either individualist or collectivist, affects how people make attributions. People from individualist cultures are more inclined to make fundamental-attribution error than people from collectivist cultures. Individualist cultures tend to attribute a person's behaviour to his internal factors whereas collectivist cultures tend to attribute a person's behaviour to his external factors. As a result, individualist cultures engage in *self-serving bias* more than do collectivist cultures, i.e. individualist cultures tend to attribute success to internal factors and to attribute failure to external factors. In contrast, collectivist cultures engage in the opposite of self-serving bias – *self-effacing bias*, which lies in attributing success to external factors and blaming failure on internal factors.

The *spotlight effect error* is the tendency of an individual to overestimate the extent to which others are paying attention to the individual's appearance and behaviour. That is, people beleive that they are in the "spotlight" and that everyone is paying attention to them, as when a person drops a cup in a restaurant and gets embarrassed, believing that everyone has seen it.

Premature closure is people's tendency to stop searching for interpretations of behaviour once there is relevant and reasonable explanations. Premature closure results as a rule from a priori information about causal relations. The individual is inclined to see in a certain situation some aspects while ignoring others and, therefore, to use standard and familiar explanations instead of true ones. The example may be parents' interpretation of their baby's crying. They tend

to render the crying as request for food and start feeding the baby, others think the baby is cold and cover the baby with a warm blanket, some interpret it as signal of pain and call the doctor, etc. Since it is quite difficult to identify the cause for crying in every particular case, people use their a priori explanations why babies cry.

The mechanism of premature closure is quite transparent: interpretations are formed on the basis of experience, professional or other stereotypes, upbringing, age, personal traits, etc.

The *egocentric bias* is based on the tendency to see one's own behaviour as normal and right. If other people act in a different way, their behaviour is seen as abnormal. Abnormality is ascribed to the partner's personal traits. In other words, the person uses his/her own behaviour as criterion and overestimates its ordinariness and conventional nature.

Experts in CCC have worked out recommendations that help people of different cultural backgrounds understand each other better and communicate more effectively. The starting point of these recommendations should be the words of CCC researcher Harry Triandis: "Wisdom of intercultural interaction lies in that you should not make precipitate conclusions when people do, in your opinion, something strange. Play up to them until you understand this culture".

According to Triandis, the following rules are the basis of successful cross-cultural communication:

1. No one can avoid communication. The individual's behaviour in communication conveys covert and overt information that one should learn to perceive.

2. Communication does not always mean understanding. Even if two people agree that they communicate and talk, it does not always mean that they understand each other. Understanding is achieved in the situation when two people understand in the same way symbols used in communication.

3. Communication is irreversible, i.e. one can never reverse transmitted information. One may explain, clarify or rephrase the message but as soon as information is transmitted, it has become part of past experience and may influence perception of present and future.

4. Communication occurs in a context (i.e. it is situational). In communication, one may not ignore conditions of communication, formed by place and time. Context is always meaningful.

4. Cross-cultural conflicts and their management

4.1. Roots of cross-cultural conflicts

There are no homogeneous cultures or societies. As a rule, they are a mosaic of various subcultures. Each of them has its own norms and rules of communication, its own values and worldview. Due to this socio-cultural diversity, people inevitably conflict with each other.

Modern science explains conflicts by many reasons. In particular, there is an opinion that hostility and prejudice between people are eternal and stem from human nature, from human dislike of differences. Representatives of social Darwinism claim that the rule of life is struggle for survival, observed in wildlife, realized in many conflicts, i.e. conflicts are as necessary as food and sleep. However, modern research refutes this point of view and proves that both hostility to foreigners and prejudice against a certain people appear as a result of many factors of social nature. This statement applies to conflicts of cross-cultural character as well. (Conflicts, however, should not be seen as merely destructive aspect of communication. They are treated as inevitable part of everyday life and are not necessarily of dysfunctional nature.)

In recent memory, a Danish newspaper published cartoon images of the Prophet Muhammad that displayed him in poor taste according to the worldwide Muslim community. On the one hand, the publication of the images was understood as an expression of the rights of freedom of speech in some cultures around the world. On the other hand, the publication was viewed as mockery of an important religious figure. All cross-cultural conflicts deal with differences in

sense-making patterns. In this given situation, there are people who feel clearly justified in publishing such images as it makes sense in their worldview. Likewise, in an alternate worldview, certain images are sacred and should not be modified for the sake of rights or other reasons. As we all know from our personal experience, such conflicts are rarely if ever solved by one side being right and the other side being wrong. [Gore 2007, p. 163]

There are many definitions of the notion "conflict". As a rule, **conflict** is defined as *discrepancy or confrontation of interests*. We will consider conflicts not as confrontation or competition between cultures but as *break in communication*.

Cultural anthropology distinguishes between several types of CC conflicts:

- conflicts *between different ethnic groups and their cultures* (Armenians and Azeris, Turks and Kurds);
- conflicts *between religious groups, representatives of different religions* (between Catholics and Protestants in Christianity, between the Sunni and the Shi'a in Islam);
- conflicts *between traditions and innovations within a culture*;
- conflicts *between different linguocultural communities and their representatives* that result from language barriers and interpretative mistakes.

The range of CC conflicts (as well as conflicts in general) is extremely wide: the basis of a conflict may be not only insufficient knowledge of a language but some almost unconscious reasons. In CCC, the reason for conflicts and tension between representatives of different cultures is often mistakes in attribution. Knowledge of partners' cultural peculiarities plays here a vital role. Cf.:

> Your German friend has presented you with an even number of flowers. Giving any present is an act of communication. Your friend may see it either as a token of special attention, or a token of conciliation or just a routine action, since his culture requires giving flowers for a birthday, without specifying their even or uneven number. But it does not mean

that this should correlate with your idea of how many flowers must be in a bunch. Certain cultural interpretation brings about tension, break in communication and, consequently, a conflict situation. But your wrong attributions, though causing some tension, should not necessarily end up with a conflict. For example, you may consider the even number of flowers as just a gap in knowledge of your culture and treat is as a mere coincidence. Yet, you may interpret it as a token of disrespect or hostility. You may think that your German friend knew for sure what the even number meant and did it on purpose. Possibly, both of the attributions are false. For example, your friend knew about the meaning of the even number and bought an uneven number of flowers, but one of them broke when he was bringing the bunch to you. He did not throw away one flower just because he believed it was not that important.

Most scientists believe that a conflict situation turns into a conflict when the two people realize the contradiction as conflict. In other words, conflicts stem from social actors themselves. Only in case you define a situation as conflict it becomes one.

According to Karl Delhees, there are three reasons for conflicts – personal peculiarities of communicators, social relations (interpersonal relations) and organizational relations [Delhees 1994].

Personal reasons for conflicts are ostentatious bad temper and ambition, frustrated individual needs, low ability or readiness to adaptation, subdued anger, career ambitions, thirst for power or strong mistrust. People with such qualities often cause conflicts.

Social reasons are strong competitiveness, insufficient appreciation of abilities, insufficient support or readiness to compromise, opposing goals or means to achieve them.

Organizational reasons are overworking, vague instructions, low competences or lack of responsibility, opposing goals, permanent changes of rules or instructions for participants, profound changes or restructuring of established positions and roles.

In cross-cultural studies, one can differentiate between the following types of conflicts:

• **Object conflict:** These conflicts involve contrasting assumptions about what is right or wrong. In this sense, the word "object" does not necessarily refer to a concrete object, but it can also mean an "object" that can be perceived intellectually. Object conflicts involve conscious or unconscious disagreement or misunderstanding about something. The cartoons of the Prophet Muhammad are a good example of an object conflict because it involves the question of whether it is right or wrong to publish them. In one worldview, it is "right" to publish the images because the interpretation of the concept of freedom of speech includes the right to publish words and images that break social rules. The same images or objects can be viewed as wrong as well because in another worldview, certain images are off limits for publication or altering. (In this particular case, we can also refer to the object as a "kernel image". A kernel image is a concept or term that both cultural communities select as important, but do not share a way of making sense of the term or concept. It is a symbol around which a conflict evolves. The images of the Prophet Muhammad that displayed him with mockery formed the kernel image of freedom of speech in societies that share this interpretation of the concept. In contrast, these same images formed the kernel image of violation of respect for religion in those societies in which the figure is sacred and which strictly forbid publishing or altering.)

• **Relationship conflict:** This conflict focuses on how two or more people connect with each other. The main distinction in a relationship conflict is identity. For example, how do identities affect rights and responsibilities, which then take on the form of behaviours? Different cultures can maintain different perceptions about rights and responsibilities for a certain identity and expectations for behaviour. Across cultures, there is not always agreement on the rights and responsibilities associated with various relationships or with what behav-

iours are even sensible within certain relationships. (For example, a teacher in Japan has responsibilities, different in some ways from those typical of, say, American teachers. Firstly, the role and responsibility of the teacher is maintained at all times, especially outside of school, where he/she sets a kind of moral standard to follow. Teachers, thus, have a very wide-spanning role in the life of the student. Teachers are expected to verbally reprimand students when they disobey.)

• **Priority conflict:** This kind of conflict involves a judgement of the relative morality of certain actions. Although judgements and values play a part in other conflicts, feelings about what is good or bad and judgements that reflect particular moral orders are at the core of priority conflicts. In a given circumstance in which we have to take a course of action, we are faced with a set of choices. This set of choices might be similar in different parts of the world, but the prioritizing of the choices can differ depending on what is valued in one culture as opposed to another, which can lead to a priority conflict. (For example, all around the world, business must prosper for the wellbeing of people to improve. The manufacturing and technology intended to improve our lives has the downside effect of causing pollution. The situation is the same for people all over the world: how to improve the standard of living through economic activity while preserving the environment? However, not all nations respond to this situation in the same manner. A good case in point is the Kyoto treaty, introduced in 1997, which aims at binding nations to reduce greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming. The world's largest polluter is the United States, which has symbolically signed the treaty, but never expects to act upon it because the costs of reducing gases would offset the economic gains. In other words, the United States has prioritized the health of the economy over that of the environment with the logic

that if people are unemployed, the consequences are more severe than trying to meet the goals set in the treaty. The nations that have signed and ratified the treaty include most countries around the world, but its most vocal proponents are largely based in the EU. These nations have prioritized the health of the environment as a prerequisite for a good standard of living. The market economy system valued in the USA places a preference on wealth creation at the expense of the environment, whereas the economic system prevailing in the EU incorporates a stronger welfare component that directly involves such matters as the environment in economic decision-making.) [Gore 2007, p. 168–170]

Conflicts are mostly possible among people who are dependent on each other (for example, business partners, friends, colleagues, relatives, spouses). The closer the relations are, the more possible the conflicts seem to be; therefore high frequency of contacts with a person enhances the possibility of conflict situations. This is true both for formal and informal relations.

In CCC, conflicts may result not only from cultural differences but also from such issues as power or status, social stratification, generation gap, etc.

4.2. Strategies for conflict management

An influential method of assessing reactions to conflict was formulated by Kenneth Thomas and Ralph Kilmann, and is known as the Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument.

Thomas and Kilmann examined individual reactions in situations involving conflict and described their behaviour using two axes: 1) assertiveness, the extent to which the individual attempts to satisfy her/his interests, and 2) co-operativeness, the extent to which the individual attempts to satisfy the other person's interests. They then used these axes to define five modes, or methods, of dealing with conflicts: *competing, collaborating, compromising and accommodating*. No mode is better than another per se; rather, each mode is ap-

propriate in certain situations but inappropriate in others, and successful conflict management depends on knowing which to choose and when. Here are some details on each mode:

1. Competing. This mode is assertive and uncooperative. The person pursues his/her own concerns, usually at the other person's expense and using whatever power seems appropriate for this end. Competing may mean standing up for one's rights, defending a position one believes is correct, or simply trying to win. Cases where competing would be appropriate include:

- emergency situations where decisive action is required;
- when unpopular courses of action need to be implemented;
- as a safeguard when non-competitive behaviour is exploited.

2. Accommodating. This is the opposite of competing – unassertive and cooperative. The person sacrifices his/her own concerns to satisfy the concerns of the other person. This includes selfless generosity or charity, obeying a command when one would prefer not to, or yielding to another's point of view. Cases where accommodating would be appropriate include:

- when one realizes one is wrong;
- when the issue is not important for one person but is important for the other;
- when continued competition would damage one's cause, for example when one's opinion is outnumbered by the opposite view;
- when preserving harmony is especially important.

3. Avoiding. This mode is unassertive and uncooperative. The person does not pursue his/her concerns directly nor does he/she yield to the other person. Rather, s/he does not address the conflict. This might take the form of diplomatically sidestepping an issue, postponing an issue until a better time or simply withdrawing from a threatening situation. Cases where avoiding would be appropriate include:

- when an issue is not as important as others at one time;
- when there's no chance to satisfy one's concerns, for example in cases of low power or when confronted by a situation where one's sphere of influence is diminished;

- when the costs of confronting a conflict outweigh the benefits of resolving it;
- when the situation involves high risk, and more information is important in assessing the advantages of a decision;
- when the issue is symptomatic of a more fundamental issue.

4. Collaborating. This is the opposite of avoiding – assertive and cooperative. The person attempts to work with another person to find a solution that satisfies the concerns of both. It attempts to identify the underlying concerns of both parties and to find an alternative that meets both sets of concerns. This includes exploring a disagreement to learn from each other's insights, resolving some condition that would otherwise have the two parties competing for resources or confronting each other and trying to find a solution to a problem. Cases where collaboration would be appropriate include:
- when the concerns of both parties are too important to be compromised;
- when the objective is to earn by understanding the views of others;
- when trying to gain commitment from others by incorporating their concerns in a decision.

5. Compromising. This is intermediate to assertiveness and cooperativeness. The person attempts to find an expedient, mutually acceptable solution that satisfies both parties. It includes addressing an issue more directly than avoiding it, but not exploring this issue in as much depth as when collaborating. It could mean exchanging concessions or seeking a middle ground. Cases where compromising is appropriate include:
- when the goals are not worth the effort of the potential disruption involved in being more assertive;
- when two opponents are equally committed and equally strong;
- when there is time pressure and an expedient solution must be reached.

There are factors that facilitate the process of managing cross-cultural conflicts:

- *common goals*: Competition is a common source of conflict, but one effective way to manage the conflict is to develop situations in which the ethnic groups in conflict must work together to achieve a desired outcome that is significant for both groups. It is important to focus on including instead of excluding people in activities.

- *supportive social climate*: There are two levels in our social environment that are highly influential toward reaching a difference in conflict: support from the community at large (institutional) and support from one's ingroup (peer). If a representative of a group in a conflict is lacking the support of either of these sides, it will be more difficult to reach a solution.

- *equal status*: Differences in status are often a cause for conflict in the first place, so this condition is naturally hard to meet. Research indicates that if the groups in conflict are relatively equal in status (e.g. a political group in conflict with another political group as opposed to a political group in conflict with an ethnic group), the chances of reaching a solution are increased. If this condition cannot be met, then it is important that the interacting group representatives are of equal status on an individual level.

- *variety of contexts*: If we interact with a group in only one context and make assumptions based on this interaction, then we are likely to make false judgements about them.

- *desire for contact*: Feeling forced into conflict resolution will likely lead to poorer results than if one feels motivated to do so. [Gore 2007, p. 172]

Besides the strategies for conflict management above, one should make use of the following rules and ploys:

- do not argue over trifles;
- do not argue with those with whom there is no use arguing;

254

- try to avoid categorical and harsh statements;
- try to find the truth rather than to win;
- admit mistakes;
- do not be vindictive;
- use humour to manage conflicts if it is relevant.

Just like any other aspect of CCC, the style of conflict management is culture determined. Considerable cultural differences are observed in methods of conflict management between English and Chinese managers: Chinese prefer more passive styles of behaviour, such as "compromise" or "pliability", while British are characterized by such active styles as "cooperation" or "competition". Preferences of Chinese are explained by their desire to achieve harmony and save face. Relationships between Chinese are based on the idea that everyone exists only as a member of a family or a clan. This obliges the individual to respect the social hierarchy. The necessity to show respect for the elder orients Chinese to subdue to power and to suppress aggression. The idea of harmony urges Chinese to look for the golden middle and teaches to achieve the balance by controlling emotions. And, finally, the notion "face" brings up the ability to keep their temper, to retain their dignity, and to avoid situations where other people might lose their face.

Reading and assignments

1. *Think of the Ukrainian model communicator. What qualities are culturally meaningful and what traits are optional? Find information on model communicators in some other culture.*

2. *Mistakes in attribution are quite frequent in cross-cultural communication. For example, the same action may be treated as offensive and benevolent by representatives of different cultures. Thus, for a Malay, to help an old lady to carry her heavy bag is a sign of respect. For an American old lady, the same action may be interpreted as humiliating: first of all, it is intrusion into her privacy and,*

secondly, such help is a hint at her inability to cope with her life, which is offensive.

Think of other examples that may illustrate attribution mistakes.

3. *Here is a dialogue between a Dutch and a French academics who were on the same plane on their way home from an international conference in Italy. The Dutchman is much younger than the French-man, who has a rather "academic" bearing. The speakers have seen each other at the conference, but not spoken to each other. On taking their seats on the plane, they find that they are next to each other. Look at their dialogue and the analysis of what went wrong and what cultural peculiarities may explain the failure in communication. (*A *stands for the Dutchman and* B *– for the Frenchman)*

A: Hello! Erm…have you seat B or the window seat?

B: *Bonjour*, um… I have to er…look. Er…the window seat.

A: What a coincidence that we should seat next to each other!

B: Yes, um…what a coincidence.

A: What did you think of the conference?

B: Well, erm…it was alright.

A: I was quite surprised you know by the efficiency of the organization. I had expected something a bit more erm…how shall I put it erm…a bit more erm… well, chaotic is too strong a word but erm…

B: I do not understand what you want to say…

A: Well, you know, there is this European joke being sheer hell if all the cooks come from Britain, all the erm…civil servants from Germany, all the policemen from France…

B: I do not like…such jokes…

A: Well, anyway it ends with that everything there is organized by the Italians…

B: That is all stereotypes. Excuse me erm…

A: I talked to other participants and some said the Italians are very careful when they organize something and do you think French share with the Italians that you want to organize well, you leave nothing to chance, want to make sure…erm…?

B: Well, you have…erm…need of some chance if you organize something big like this congress. *Tant de choses peuvent*…

A: I don't understand…

B: Oh, *excusez-moi*…

A: …No, no, not the French but you said you need chance…

B: You see, erm…my English is not so good.

A: No, I think I misunderstood, "leaving to chance" means not to take risks…

B: You must excuse me, I cannot follow… (*searches in his bag for something*)

A: Well, I see you have other things to do… [De Jong 1996, p. 108–109]

• *Rewrite the dialogue correcting the discourse mistakes of the two speakers. The Dutchman should show more respect to the Frenchman, e.g. by asking if it is all right to speak English, by being less direct in bringing up stereotypical views of other cultures, by using phrases that help to create openness and by suspending judgment.*

• *What behaviour would be appropriate in case one of the speakers were Ukrainian?*

4. *Culture is encoded not only in the semantic structures of a language, but also in its idiomatic expressions that both reflect and direct the way we think. Different languages predispose their speakers to view reality in different ways through the different metaphors they use. Read an abstract on culturally specific metaphors and answer the questions below:*

In most of the little things we do every day, we simply think and act more or less automatically along certain lines. Just what these lines are is by no means obvious. One way to find out is by looking at language… Primarily on the basis of linguistic evidence, we have found that most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature…

To give some idea of what it could mean for a concept to be metaphorical and for such a concept to structure an everyday activity, let us start with the concept ARGUMENT and the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. This metaphor is reflected in our everyday language by a number of expressions:

ARGUMENT IS WAR

Your claims are *indefensible*

His criticisms *were right on target*

He *attacked every weak point* in my argument

257

I *demolished* his argument

I'*ve* never *won* an argument with him

You disagree? OK, *shoot*!

If you use this strategy, he'll *wipe* you *out*

He *shot down* all of my arguments

It is important to see that we don't just *talk* about arguments in terms of war. We can actually win or lose arguments. We see the person we are arguing with as an opponent. We attack his positions and we defend our own… Many of the things we *do* in arguing are partially structured by the concept of war. Though there is no physical battle, there is a verbal battle… It is in this sense that the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor is one that we live by in this culture; it structures the actions we perform in arguing.

Try to imagine a culture where arguments are not viewed in terms of war, where no one wins or loses, where there is no sense of attacking or defending, gaining or losing ground. Imagine a culture where an argument is viewed as a dance, the participants are seen as performers, and the goal is to perform in a balanced and aesthetically pleasing way. In such a culture, people would view arguments differently, experience them differently, carry them out differently, and talk about them differently. But *we* would probably not view them as arguing at all: they would simply be doing something different. It would seem strange even to call what they were doing "arguing". [Lakoff, Johnson 1980, p. 3–5]

- *Do you think the examples above could be interpreted differently than "Argument is war"?*
- *Think of other concepts that might fit the "war" metaphor.*

5. *The Dutch have a saying* I buy in my language and I sell in yours. *It is a part of the Dutch ethos to be aware of the need to be able to communicate in other languages. What factors, in your opinion, make an ethos flexible as to readiness to speak foreign languages? What conflict management strategies would you expect from such peoples?*

Review the different approaches to conflict and try to categorize your personal orientation to conflict along with a justification for why you tend to behave in this way. Also, consider how Ukrainian culture as a group responds to conflict. You can site any international or intergroup events involving conflict to support your point of view.

CHAPTER VIII
Obstacles and Results
of Cross-Cultural Communication

1. Stereotypes
in Cross-Cultural Communication

1.1. Notion of stereotype

Communication between representatives of different cultures is often influenced by certain preconceptions. The individual shows a natural propensity to perceive foreigners from the point of view of his/her culture, to measure by his/her own bushel. These preconceptions become prompts that help to form an opinion and to evaluate other people (e.g. French see Belgians as slow-witted simpletons deprived of a sense of humour, Swiss treat Belgians as narrow-minded, thrifty and calculating pedants, Italians believe that Belgians like to make things up. According to French ethnic stereotypes, a Greek is an enterprising person, a Turk is physically strong, a Pole likes drinking. Englishmen are often accused of being calculating and selfish, Germans are described as excessively disciplined, organized, industrious and aggressive).

Research into these preconceived ideas started in Western science in the 20s of the 20th century when the American writer, journalist and political commentator Walter Lippmann defined them as stereotypes and coined the metaphor, calling a stereotype a "picture in our heads". According to Lippmann, stereotypes are biased opinions that control the process of perception. They mark certain objects as either familiar or unknown and therefore profoundly strange. The negative assess-

ment of stereotypes dominated Western science up to the end of the 50s. Then scholars started to admit that the content of a stereotype may be to a certain extent true. In the early 70s, the attitude to stereotypes in American science changed considerably. Attention was paid to concrete forms and types of stereotype: social, ethnic, age, etc.

Despite the diversity of approaches and views on stereotypes, Western research is based on the statement that *a **stereotype** is standardized and simplified conceptions of groups of individuals based on some prior assumptions*.

As stereotypes are a form of collective consciousness, their roots should be looked for in people's life that is characterized by multiple repetitions of routine situations. This routine is fixed in human consciousness as standard schemes and models of thought. Stereotypes are formed owing to human ability to register information about homogeneous phenomena, facts and people in a form of set ideal structures. Distinguishing certain external phenomena, consciousness brings to life a stereotype, quickly adding qualitative characteristics of the phenomena. As a result, homogeneous phenomena are fixed in consciousness with the help of corresponding images and assessments that assist people to exchange information, understand each other, work out identical value systems.

We may distinguish between different types of stereotypes, e.g. group, professional, ethnic, age, etc. The basis of an ethnic stereotype is frequently some noticeable feature in appearance (colour of skin, form of eyes, lips, hair type, height, e.g. *little people, eyetie* for Asians, *chocolate, shoe-shine* for AfroAmericans). The basis may also turn out to be a certain peculiarity of character or behaviour (thrift, sense of humour, e.g. *coon* for AfroAmericans, *frog* for the French, *spaghetti* for Italians*, bogtrotters* for the Irish, *chopsticks* for Asians). (Interestingly, features, interpreted as cleverness of one's own ethnic group, in representatives of other groups are treated as cunning and slyness, just like things that are referred to as persistence when talking about oneself, are seen as stubbornness in a foreigner. This is so-called "in-group favouritism", i.e. tendency to form positive ***autostereotypes*** (stereotype of one's own group) and negative ***heterostereotypes*** (stereotypes of other ethnic groups.)

A true generator of stereotypes is always a group. Ethnic stereotypes become the main determinants in cross-cultural com-

munication (e.g. familiar stereotypes of a polite and slim Englishman, an eccentric Italian, a light-minded, frivolous Frenchman or "mysterious Slavonic soul").

> Here are stereotypes of post-Soviet Russia described in a novel by Maria Arbatova. The main character, a Russian painter, comes to Germany and is asked by her German friend to clear her new theatrical staging of wrong details: "...она хотела, чтобы я хирургическим способом извлекла ляпы в эскизах костюмов и декораций спектакля по пьесе русской драматургессы, а там их была полная корзина. И по сцене героиня бегала в рваных колготках, что означало тяжелый ход экономических реформ, и новый русский во время полового акта придерживал на пояснице кобуру, что означало высокий криминоген, и в квартире пожилого любовника стояла статуя Ленина, что означало его партийное прошлое, и молодой музыкант был в среднеевропейском прикиде, хотя и приехал из Рязани. Мы набрасывали костюмы героев, бутафорские мелочи, и я обещала прислать ей из дома ручную мясорубку для сцены героини с пожилой матерью, потому что Герда никак не могла понять, как может выглядеть ручная мясорубка..." [АМВНД, с. 249—250]

Personal experience with representatives of a different culture does not, as a rule, lead to any corrections of the stereotype even if one notices obvious deviations from the preconceived image. If it is the case, our experience interprets these as exception, while the stereotype is considered the norm.

1.2. Formation and functions of stereotypes

There is nothing surprising or bad about stereotypes. Getting and processing necessary information about the world, people naturally prefer the information that corresponds to their inner logic, supports conventional opinions and keeps in line with their values and priorities. A stereotype appears when we turn to our life experience – individual and group – and depends on previous perception. The process

of stereotype formation is accompanied by interaction of various psychic elements: images, opinions, intonation, meanings, repetitive assessment, emotions, etc.

The mechanism of stereotype formation is based on categorization. The ever-changing world simply overloads the individual with new information and forces the individual to classify this information into more convenient and customary models. Life without stereotypes would require the person to be constantly on guard and would turn the person's life into a number of trials and errors. Stereotypes help the individual to differentiate and simplify the world, "put things in order", release the individual from the need to re-discover the same phenomena over and over again. Thus, the main reason for stereotype formation is protection from ever-increasing bulk of information. Deprived of this protection, human consciousness would get confused with ever-lasting assessments. Stereotypes greatly simplify and mitigate this process.

Stereotypes are mainly formed as a result of socialization and enculturation. Since stereotypes are part of culture, the habit to think in a certain way about other ethnic groups is instilled from the early childhood. Most stereotypes are passed down and develop according to images, created in our brain by our parents. They are finally formed at the age of 12–30, after which they are well-fixed and are changed with much difficulty (it concerns not only our interpretation of other groups but also our ideas of how our group is seen by others).

Secondly, stereotypes are formed in communication with close people – parents, friends, peers, teachers, etc. If, for example, children hear that their parents say that "you should not look into a Gypsy's eyes or you'll be deceived" or that "Jews are thrifty", they take this information as relevant and true.

Thirdly, stereotypes may appear due to personal contacts. Thus, if you have been cheated by an Azeri vendor on the market, you may conclude that all Azeris are swindlers, i.e. you form a stereotype on the ground of limited information.

Fourthly, an important role in stereotype formation is performed by mass media. For the majority of people, the press, radio and TV are trustworthy, reliable sources of information. The opinion of mass media becomes people's opinion. That is why, even having no per-

sonal experience in cross-cultural communication, people ascribe foreigners with certain appearance and character.

Thus, stereotypes help to divide people into groups and ascribe these groups with certain qualities. One of the functions performed by stereotypes is to provide comparison with other peoples and help to feel their individuality. Other functions are explanation of human behaviour (stereotypes suggest availabie and simple information about socio-cultural peculiarities);

- prediction of the partner's behaviour patterns;
- formation of the individual's own behaviour;
- protection of customs, habits, culture of one's own cultural group;
- preservation of people's ideals, patterns, standards of behaviour;
- stabilization and integration of socio-cultural groups in a society.

Since a stereotype is born in group consciousness, it may be adequately used only in inter-group relations for the sake of quick orientation in a situation and for the sake of identification of other people's ethnic status. Orientation and identification occur almost immediately. As long as we distinguish certain features of a group status, a relevant stereotype is actualized. To start up this mechanism, one does not need any personal experience; the main thing is not to be mistaken in orientation.

Though stereotypes are schematic and general, they prepare people of different cultures to interact and attenuate culture shock. In cross-cultural communication, the individual perceives partners through their actions. Adequate understanding of the actions and their causes determines the type of relations between the communicators. Stereotypes help to guess reasons and possible consequences of one's own and other people's actions as well as help to foresee their behaviour.

It should be noted that, as a rule, communicators are guided by stereotypes from the very beginning. Obviously, there are no people, absolutely free from stereotypes, one may only discuss different degrees of stereotypization of communicators (interestingly, there has been registered the reverse proportion between the degree of stereotypization and experience in CCC, i.e. the more the individual participates in cross-cultural interactions, the fewer stereotypes he/she maintains).

On the whole, stereotypization helps people to understand the situation and act according to new circumstances in the following cases:

- *If a stereotype is maintained consciously*: the individual should understand that a stereotype reflects group norms and values, group traits rather than specific traits, peculiar to a certain individual in the group.
- *If a stereotype is descriptive rather than evaluative*: stereotypes reflect objective traits of people from the group, not their evaluation as good or bad.
- *If a stereotype is precise*: the stereotype adequately reflects traits of a group.
- *If a stereotype is treated just as a guess rather then authentic information about a group*: the first impression of the group is not always authentic knowledge about all individuals from the group.
- *If a stereotype is modified*: the stereotype changes through further observation of people or a real-life situation.

Stereotypes hinder communication in the following cases:

- *If stereotypes do not let people reveal individual peculiarities*: stereotypization presupposes that all group members share the same traits. This approach is applied to the whole group and to each individual in particular.
- *If stereotypes enhance fallacious assumption and beliefs*.
- *If stereotypes are based on half-truth and distortions*. Preserving real traits of a stereotyped group, stereotypes distort reality and give wrong ideas of people.

2. Prejudices in Cross-Cultural Communication

2.1. Notion of prejudice

Knowledge about typical features of other peoples depends both on their typical qualities and on forms and intensity of contacts. Contacts may result not only in stereotypes but also in prejudices.

Psychologists view **prejudice** *as biased and hostile attitude to something or somebody without sufficient grounds.* Applied to ethnic groups or their cultures, prejudice is a biased and hostile attitude to members of these groups, their cultures and to any facts related with their activity, behaviour and social status.

The main factor in prejudice formation is inequality of social, economic, cultural and living conditions of different ethnic communities. This factor also determines such a wide-spread form of prejudice as *xenophobia* – dislike to foreigners. Prejudices appear as a result of insufficient or distorted information about an ethnic community. Appearing on the basis of associations, imagination or supposition, the image of the community with a distorted informational component strongly influences people's attitude.

We should bear in mind differences between a stereotype and a prejudice in CCC. As it has already been pointed out, stereotypes reflect certain traits, peculiar to all members of a certain sociocultural group. This is a kind of generalized, collective image of the group that may be positive as well as negative.

Unlike stereotypes, prejudices are exceptionally negative and hostile evaluation of a group or an individual that belongs to the group. Prejudices are characterized by negative attitude to all members of a group or to the majority of them. The most well-known forms of prejudices are racism, sexism, and homophobia.

Prejudices, as well as stereotypes, are elements of a culture, since they appear due to social rather than biological reasons. As a rule, they are set and widely spread elements of everyday routine culture, passed on from generation to generation with the help of customs, beliefs or normative acts.

2.2. Formation of prejudices

Many psychological studies show that there is a special mechanism that directs the person's emotional reaction onto the individual who is not in any causal relation with this reaction. This *psychological process* is often used in cultivation of ethnocentrism, stereotypes and prejudices and is called *transference.*

Psychological transference may occur either unconsciously – as protective mechanism of psyche – or be promoted deliberately – in search

of a scapegoat, who is blamed for a failure or mistake. Psychological transference is not exclusively a fact of an individual psychic activity. It is characteristic of the collective psychic process and may embrace a considerable number of people. Transference helps to project anger and hostility onto an object that has nothing to do with these emotions.

Resulting from incomplete or distorted knowledge, prejudices may imbue almost everything – objects and animals, people and their associations, ideas and images, etc. The most widespread type of prejudices are *ethnic*. Prejudices are, in fact, an attempt of the lower stratum of the domineering ethnic group to find a source of psychic satisfaction from the feeling of imaginary superiority, though they are at the bottom of the social ladder due to poor financial situation. Lack of true prestige together with a low social status among the domineering ethnic group is compensated with the help of illusory prestige from membership in a "higher race".

Western psychology has developed many theories on prejudice formation. One of them is *the theory of frustration and aggression*. According to this theory, human psyche, due to certain negative emotions, gets into a state of tension – *frustration*. This state requires discharging, and it may be directed at anyone. When the causes of difficulties and adversities are seen in a certain ethnic group, frustration is projected against this group.

According to another theory, prejudices are formed due to the human need to identify their status in relation to others on the ground of their own group superiority. The other group's achievements are ignored: instead, negative qualities are ascribed. Positive identification is connected mainly with one's native culture, while the other cultural group is granted with negative identification or even suffers from overt discrimination.

All in all, every individual absorbs prejudices in the process of socialization. Their source is the individual's close environment, first of all parents, teachers, friends. Thus, the individual inherits his/her ancestors' prejudices rather than acquires them from his/her own cross-cultural experience.

2.3. Types of prejudices

In everyday life, the influence of prejudices is enormous. Firstly, prejudices drastically distort perception of people from other ethnic or socio-cultural groups – a biased person sees what he/she wants to see rather than what really is. That is why positive traits usually go unnoticed.

Secondly, among biased people, there is often an unconscious feeling of anxiety over those whom they discriminate. Biased people usually see in a discriminated group a potential threat which gives rise to more mistrust.

Thirdly, prejudices undermine, in the long run, self-esteem of the discriminated. The feeling of social inferiority, imposed on a great number of people, makes them try to restore their self-esteem with the help of ethnic or cultural conflicts.

One may differentiate between the following types of prejudices:

- *bright groundless prejudices* that openly assert that members of other groups are, for some reasons, worse than representatives of their own group;
- *symbolic prejudices* are based on negative feelings to other ethnic groups: they are perceived as threat to basic cultural values;
- *long arm prejudices* imply positive behaviour in respect to members of the other group only in certain situations (e.g. random acquaintance, formal meetings). The situation of a closer contact (e.g. being neighbours, marriage) reveal the unfriendly attitude;
- *overt antipathy* presupposes an openly negative attitude to other groups in case their behaviour is not approved by the person's group;
- *escapist prejudice* means terminating contacts with the other group, since people always feel awkward communicating with foreigners and prefer dealing with representatives of their own group in order to avoid feeling nervous or emotional.

2.4. Correction and modification of prejudices

In fact, prejudices are hardly liable to change and, once adopted, they are difficult to eradicate. Particularly stable are ethnic prejudices. Thus, a person will rather easily give up prejudices concerning cars of a certain make but it will be much more difficult to eliminate a negative opinion of a certain ethnic group. The equal status of individuals is a condition to modify prejudices.

It would be naïve to claim that modifying stereotypes and prejudices may be done easily and quickly with the help of social technologies or methods. In fact, people are inclined to remember the information that supports a prejudice and ignore the information that contradicts it. If prejudices have ever been maintained by a person, it will take time to eradicate them. Yet, though it is impossible to eliminate a prejudice from human consciousness altogether, it may be made less pronounced, more comprehensible, and more conscious.

3. Results of Cross-Cultural Communication

3.1. Cross-cultural competence

To define skills that provide successful cross-cultural communication, it is necessary to consider the notion of *cross-cultural competence*. In fact, cross-cultural competence is a unity of at least three components: linguistic, communicative and cultural competence. Here, "competence" means not only a sum of knowledge and strategies that the individual may use in CCC, but also ability to adequately assess a communicative situation, to correlate intentions with a choice of verbal and non-verbal means, to realize the communicative intentions and to verify results of a communicative act.

The term *linguistic competence* was first suggested by Noam Chomsky who interpreted it as "linguistic intuition", as "linguistic knowledge", as the individual's ability to use the abstract system of language rules. (Taking into account the conclusions of Chapter III,

linguistic competence goes far beyond mere mastering of language use: it presupposes worldview modifications as well.)

According to Chomsky's theory, linguistic competence embraces the phonological, syntactic and semantic components. Manfred suggests distinguishing also between the grammatical competence – the speaker's/hearer's ability to choose the appropriate language signs and rules to combine them into language structures [Манфред 1987, c.198]. Some linguists point out such components of linguistic competence as skills in spelling, functional styles and ability to process a text. In other words, linguistic competence is a multi-faceted phenomenon that presupposes a number of skills.

Linguistic competence allows several dimensions:

- knowledge of a language;
- linguistic competence of educated and uneducated speakers;
- linguistic competence of native and non-native speakers;
- linguistic competence of language speakers and linguists [Карасик 1992, c. 63–64].

In CCC, linguistic competence determines the correct choice of verbal means, adequate in a certain situation; accurate reference; correlation between mental and real models; ability to reproduce past communicative experience in analogous situations. Linguistic competence is relative in terms of CCC. Firstly, its relativity results from the fact that evaluation of linguistic competence differs for members of different social groups. Secondly, cultures may differ in their ideas of correct and incorrect language use (e.g. some forms of American English are considered to be mistakes by British English speakers). Thirdly, requirements to native speakers differ from those to foreigners. Fourthly, evaluation of linguistic competence differs due to communicative goals: the individual may do well in everyday communication but lack linguistic competence to maintain more specific interactions (e.g. discussing professional or philosophic issues).

Since language is tightly bound with thinking, CCC may bring about a conflict between linguistic competence in native and foreign languages. The individual, accustomed to expressing precisely and accurately in the native language, will take painfully a lack of verbal

means in a foreign tongue. In frequent CC interactions, this may stimulate upgrading the foreign language knowledge and moving to a higher level of linguistic competence.

It should also be remembered that the individual imbues language meanings with his/her personal experience: these are connotations, semantic changes, assimilation of a word, etc. Thus, the individual as a new member of a language community, even with good knowledge of a language, quite often uses a language, deprived of connotations and nuances, shared by the community.

On the whole, language acquisition is influenced by the following factors:

- social (duration of residence in a foreign culture, relations between native and non-native speakers, etc.);
- affective (instrumental or integrative motivation, acculturation stress, attitude to a culture, etc.);
- personal (tolerance to uncertainty, self-esteem, etc.);
- cognitive (cognitive style, dependence/independence from surrounding);
- biological.

Despite the importance of correct pronunciation, knowledge of vocabulary and grammar, they are not enough to use a foreign language appropriately in communication. Language is only one of the aspects in the individual's psychological ability to maintain communication. This idea confirms Chomsky's suggestion to differentiate between *linguistic competence*, i.e. inner grammar of an abstract language speaker, and *linguistic performance*, i.e. understanding and speech production in certain communicative situations.

Communicative competence. Since linguistic competence covers only a part of skills necessary for adequate communication, important functions are performed by communicative competence. It consists of mechanisms, tactics and strategies that provide effective interactions. Requirements to communicative competence in CCC are quite high, since cross-cultural communication presupposes that the individual knows not only rules of human communication as such but also takes into account cultural differences and feels slightest changes in communicative situations and partners' behaviour. Here

the individual should be ready to admit his/her lack of knowledge, as well as to admit mistakes and to be prepared to repair them.

The components of communicative competence as it is understood in the theory of cross-cultural communication are the following:

- ACTIVE PARTICIPATION
  - ability to interpret culturally specific signals of partners' willingness/unwillingness to communicate;
  - ability to feel the timing for floor-taking, as it is accepted in a certain situation in a certain culture;
  - efficiency, i.e. ability to adequately express one's idea and to grasp the partner's message;
  - ability to direct an interaction;
  - ability to interpret and perform culturally specific floor-taking signals (as well as signals to terminate an interaction);
- ADEQUATE CHOICE
  - of communicative distance;
  - of topic;
  - of discourse type and register;
  - of verbal and non-verbal means;
  - strategies;
- DYNAMICS
  - empathy;
  - adaptation to cultural differences and partners' social status;
  - flexibility of choosing and switching topics;
  - willingness to correct one's own communicative behaviour.

Cultural competence is the most essential factor necessary for effective cross-cultural communication. Cultural competence means understanding of presuppositions, background knowledge, value systems, psychological and social identity, peculiar to a culture.

The term *cultural competence* to a certain extent correlates with the term *cultural literacy*. In fact, differentiation between components of cultural literacy is a complicated, controversial and much discussed problem. What information shall the individual receive to

be considered "culturally literate"? Shall it be a local culture or the world culture? And, finally, can it be expressed either qualitatively or quantitatively?

The most well-known attempt to formulate the notion of cultural literacy has been made by E.D.Hirsh in his book *Cultural Literacy*. Hirsh, an ardent supporter of American model of acculturation, compares a national thesaurus with the American currency. The essence of Hirsh' theory is an attempt to present the cultural thesaurus of an educated American as basis of effective communication within American culture (also see p. 147–148).

Obviously, cultural competence presupposes correlation of partners' cultural literacy when the topic and the context of a communicative situation are concerned. Since cross-cultural communication is, by its nature, asymmetric, a non-native speaker takes the most burden.

Cultural competence of the individual should embrace the ability to interpret correctly such cultural language units as toponyms, anthroponyms, political terms, book and film titles as well as to differentiate between their importance for CCC. For example, to communicate adequately with Americans, one should know that Thomas Jefferson was the author of the Declaration of Independence and famous scientist. Yet, an average American could hardly know the details of his death. On the other hand, anyone knows date and tragic circumstances of Abraham Lincoln or John Kennedy's deaths. Thus, the individual should try to acquire the cultural knowledge, associated with an average representative of a culture.

Cultural literacy is most dynamic: besides rather established historical and geographic data, it includes latest political events, scandals, fashion, etc., that appear as quickly as are forgotten.

One should also take into account that cultural literacy covers not only culturally specific information but knowledge of the world in general. Lack of the knowledge of the world gives rise to the phenomenon, called by Hirsh *new illiteracy*.

Cross-cultural communication is a sphere where various types of competence (linguistic, cultural, communicative) may become separated. The individual, who speaks a language fluently, may lack communicative or cultural competence (which used to be true in the former Soviet Union where English was taught with the help of texts

about a technician Ivanov, a member of the Communist Party). On the other hand, the individual may know well history and culture but may not speak the language. The individual, who does not know cultural peculiarities and does not speak the language, may turn out to be a gifted empathetic communicator, which helps him/her to use non-verbal means to find a common language and get by well in a foreign culture (also see p. 46–48).

Adequate cross-cultural understanding is directly proportional to levels of linguistic, communicative and cultural competence. In case of asymmetry, the individual is highly likely to face difficulties, since a fluent speaker is expected to be culturally literate.

In CCC, the individual may tend to either over- or underestimate his/her level of cultural and linguistic competence, which is mainly determined by his/her psychological qualities. Some people feel anxious when speaking a foreign language, others get by with the help of a very limited vocabulary. Both over- and underestimation of one's cross-cultural competence are obstacles in cross-cultural communication. Overestimating the partner's competence, one forgets about the partner's lack of language or cultural knowledge, which may result in a loss of some part of information. Underestimating the partner, one starts to use a simplified language that is usually spoken to children, foreigners, sick people, which may offend the partner.

All in all, the sufficient level of cross-cultural competence is associated with the level of linguistic, communicative and cultural competence that enables adequate communication in a certain social group (professional, age and status parameters included).

3.2. Tolerance

Notion of tolerance. Human world is never-ending communication and interaction. Everyone is guided by values and norms accepted in their cultures. People do not consider themselves to be a product of this culture and seldom think that others' behaviour may be determined by different values and norms. Naturally, this ethnocentric point of view hinders communication, since every culture reflects only part of experience accumulated by humankind.

One of the principal ideas of CCC lies in that one should not make rash conclusions when people do something strange but should

try to understand their culture. It is possible only with the help of cross-cultural tolerance, i.e. willingness to communicate with people of other cultures, openness, and freedom from prejudices.

Historically, most incidents and writings pertaining to toleration involve the conflict between a dominant religion and minority viewpoints (in the 20th century, analysis of the doctrine of toleration has been expanded to include political and ethnic groups, homosexuals and other minorities). The concept of tolerance was passionately discussed by philosophers of the 16th – 18th centuries (first of all by Voltaire, the consistent critic of fanaticism, who published his *Treatise on Toleration* in 1763. Voltaire attacked religious superstition, but also said, "It does not require great art, or magnificently trained eloquence, to prove that Christians should tolerate each other. I, however, am going further: I say that we should regard all men as our brothers. What? The Turk my brother? The Chinaman my brother? The Jew? The Siam? Yes, without doubt; are we not all children of the same father and creatures of the same God?"). Public recognition of tolerance as universal human value and the foundation of peace between religions, peoples and various socio-cultural groups took place in 1789 when the Constituent Assembly in France adopted the Declaration of Human Rights and Freedoms. The Declaration heralded the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. It was the first time when the main principles of peace, non-violence and democracy were stated and when it was pointed out that violence results from intolerance and suppression of democracy.

The notion "tolerance" is derived from the Latin verb *tolero* – "carry", "hold", "endure". It was used when one had to carry something and implied that this caused suffering and efforts. The term owes its present popularity to the English "tolerance" (for more detail see [Wierzbicka 2006]).

The majority of scholars today treat tolerance as respect and recognition of equality, rejection of domination and violence, recognition of human cultural diversity, and pluralism. All in all, tolerance presupposes willingness to take people as they are.

The basis of the tolerant attitude is a positive ethnic identity, where the positive image of one's own ethnic group co-exists with the positive attitude to other ethnic groups. The positive identity

should also be seen as condition for independent and stable existence of an ethnic group

Thus, tolerance presupposes recognition of other people's rights, their equality, understanding and sympathy. Tolerance implies that other people have the right to express freely their views and act in a certain way provided they respect other cultures, behaviour patterns and opinions. Everyone is free to follow their convictions and beliefs and recognize other people's right to do the same. It also means that people differ when their appearance, status, language, behaviour and values are concerned and have the right to preserve their individuality. It also means that anyone's views must not be imposed on other people.

Tolerance in CCC. Tolerance is based on respect for differences. Differences may be of various types – cultural, ethnic, racial, social, etc. Culture of tolerance presupposes obligatory respect for the majority of these differences, since they result from natural historical processes. Still, culture of tolerance does not suggest tolerance to social inequality in its extreme realizations. In cases where group membership correlates with class membership (i.e. social inequality), tolerance is unacceptable. When cultural differences correlate with class differences, intolerance turns particularly violent.

The tolerant approach in CCC means recognizing that the individual has the right to maintain his/her cultural features, the right to be different from others. It is tolerance that optimizes cross-cultural relations and helps to settle cross-cultural conflicts.

Tolerance in cross-cultural communication is relative rather than absolute. Americans, for example, cannot understand why Ukrainians tolerate routine difficulties, consumers' rights and human rights violation, violations on the part of state officials. Ukrainians, in their turn, cannot understand why Americans, showing such tolerance to sexual minorities or religious differences, do not recognize other opinions on such issues as the role of the USA in the world, democracy, etc.

Intolerance, on the contrary, is based on the conviction of superiority, which encourages people to dominate and destroy, to hate those who support other ways of life. In practice, intolerance is expressed in a variety of forms – from impoliteness, neglect of other nationalities to ethnic cleansing and genocide, deliberate annihilation of people. The main forms of intolerance are:

- humiliation, mockery, neglect;
- negative stereotypes, prejudices;
- ethnocentrism;
- discrimination on various grounds: restriction of human rights, isolation in society;
- racism, nationalism, exploitation, fascism;
- xenophobia;
- destruction of religious and cultural shrines;
- exile, segregation, repressions;
- religious persecution.

Tolerant attitude to other cultures is achieved if one follows the practical recommendations below:

1. Be aware that a representative of any culture does not set world standards.
2. Respect other cultures just like you respect your own.
3. Do not judge values, beliefs and customs of other cultures on the basis of your own values.
4. Always remember that values are culturally relative.
5. Never feel superior to others' religion or culture.
6. When communicating with representatives of the other religion, try to understand and respect this religion.
7. Try to understand cooking and eating traditions of other peoples, since they have been formed due to specific needs and resources.
8. Respect costumes, conventional in other cultures.
9. Do not demonstrate disgust to unusual smells if they are taken as pleasant by representatives of other cultures.
10. Do not consider the colour of skin a "natural" basis for communication with a person.
11. Do not view a person inferior if the person's accent differs from yours.
12. Be aware that each culture, no matter how small it may be, has something to offer to the world and there is no culture that monopolizes all the aspects.

13. Do not try to use your high status in your cultural hierarchy to influence behaviour of representatives of other cultures.

14. Always remember that no scientific data have confirmed superiority of one ethnic group over the other.

Teaching tolerance is one of the most important tasks of modern education. To instill the tolerant attitude to other cultures means providing

- deep and multi-faceted knowledge of one's own culture as obligatory requirement for integration in other cultures;
- the positive attitude to cultural differences;
- formation and development of CC communication skills;
- upbringing in the atmosphere of peace, tolerance, humane CC communication.

The main educational principle to achieve the goals is the principle of dialogue, which means respect and recognition of all national cultures within modern world culture.

Nevertheless, people cannot feel psychologically healthy without building their cultural and ethnic identity. Only a person with a positive ethno-cultural identity is capable to live happily in the modern globalized world.

Reading and assignments

1. *Explain the difference between prejudice and stereotype. How do they influence communication?*

2. *Read the following abstracts and compare stereotypes maintained by Ukrainians with those, described in the abstracts. Do you find any contradicting stereotypes? Think if you can add anything to the list.*

Members of one culture cherish stereotypical views of members of other cultures. The Dutch look upon the English as typically trustwor-

thy, friendly, approachable people; they are almost like the Dutch themselves in many respects. The reputation of the Germans on the other hand is terrible: they are harsh, overbearing loudmouths who insist upon occupying their particular spot on the beach and everything that goes with it. The French are too far away to have much of a reputation, apart from a Latin-lover type of fame, but if they do have one, it is one of arrogance (…) French cuisine and French wine enjoy a high reputation in the Netherlands, even among those who have never even seen a four-star restaurant from the outside. French is still the language of upper-class culture in many respects. [De Jong 1996, p. 16]

…Daniel has gone to New York. He will clearly by now have got off with thin American cool person called Winona who puts out, carries a gun and is everything I am not. [FHBJD, p. 39]

The Americans are an extremely interesting people. They are absolutely reasonable. I think that is their distinguishing characteristic. Yes, Mr. Erskine, an absolutely reasonable people. I assure you there is no nonsense about the Americans. [WOPDG, p. 49]

"Kids are important. They're the only people that matter. If I had kids, I'd lay down my life for them. I'd be squeezing their chubby chops all the time saying haven't you grown, like my grandma does with me," said Frank, giggling.

"Don't be so Jewish." [SALM, p. 157]

3. *What is cross-cultural competence? What are its components?*

4. *Comment on the notion of "tolerance". Analyze Ukrainian educational system in terms of promoting tolerance in the society. What measures could be added to prepare Ukrainians to live in the globalized world?*

5. *Read the final passages from Edward T.Hall's* Beyond Culture *and answer the questions that follow:*

The paradoxical part of the identification syndrome is that until it has been resolved there can be no friendship and no love – only hate. Until we can allow others to be themselves, and ourselves to be free, it is impossible to truly love another human being; neurotic and dependent love is perhaps possible, but not genuine love, which can be generated only in the self.

The processes being discussed here are much more common than might be supposed, and since the function of maintaining some behaviours out-of-awareness is to keep things safely hidden – safe from change and beyond reach of reason – any behaviour that falls in the out-of-awareness category will be highly persisting in man.

In most people – those who are reasonably well acculturated so that they can function according to the informal rules controlling the various and sundry groups that go to make up their lives – one finds a high degree of sensitivity and responsiveness to the identification needs of others. These are people one gets along with, who don't raise ripples in the pond of life, who give extraordinary consistency to the informal culture of any given group. Which brings us back to intercultural and interethnic encounters. Theoretically, there should be no problem when people of different cultures meet. Things begin, most frequently, not only with friendship and good will on both sides, but there is an intellectual understanding that each party has a different set of beliefs, customs, mores, values, or what-have-you. The trouble begins when people have to start working together, even on a superficial basis. Frequently, even after years of close association, neither can make the other's system work! The difficulties I and others have observed persist so long and are so resistant to change that they can be explained only in psychological terms: people are in and remain in the grip of the cultural type of identification. Without knowing it, they experience the other person as an uncontrollable and unpredictable part of themselves. I used to see this years ago in Iran, where, at the time, bullying was an accepted and frequent mode of interaction with those who were not in one's own entourage and who were weaker, less powerful, or less influential than oneself. No amount of explanation could convince Americans that the Iranians were not behaving badly and dispel the extreme discomfort they experienced when they saw a more powerful or influential Iranian bullying a weaker one in public. I have also observed the identification process at work in American businessmen in Japan, where they ignore Japanese successes and American failures and persist in telling the Japanese how to do business the American way.

In America, we encounter interethnic identification in another form. Here the groups have lived together, in many instances for

generations. They no longer have the goodwill (so fleetingly and quickly dispelled) that one finds when traveling. Instead, there is a deep emotional involvement of the type observed in the family where there is a generation gap. Again, the only thing that explains the feelings and the behavior that one observes is that there is a significant identification factor on all sides. Individuals who are willing to let others be themselves without paying a dreadful price for it are very rare indeed. There has been some progress here and there, yet one seldom hears the remark: "The trouble I have with him is me."

Possibly the most important psychological aspect of culture – the bridge between culture and personality – is the identification process. This process, which works admirably when change is slow but wreaks havoc in times of rapid change such as we are currently experiencing, is most certainly a major impediment to cross-cultural understanding and effective relations among the peoples of the world. Man must now embark on the difficult journey beyond culture, because the greatest separation feat of all is when one manages to gradually free oneself from the grip of unconscious culture. [Hall 1989, p. 238–240]

- *How, according to Hall, are related culture and personality?*
- *What hinders intercultural communication and what facilitates it?*
- *What key notion permeates the passage?*

REFERENCES

1. Алєксєєва І.О. Розуміння текстів як ілюстрація взаємозв'язку мови мислення та культури // Проблеми семантики слова, речення та тексту. Збірник наукових статей. – К.: Київський держ.лінгв.ун-т, 2002. – Вип. № 8. – С. 7–11.

2. Бабаева А.В. Стереотипы поведения в истории культуры: Автореф. дисс…канд.культурол.наук. – СПб, 1998. – 17 с.

3. Баронин А.С. Этническая психология. – Киев: Тандем, 2000. – 264 с.

4. Бацевич Ф.С. Основи комунікативної лінгвістики. – К.: Видавничий центр "Академія", 2004. – 342 с.

5. Берестнев Г.И. К философии слова (лингвокультурологический аспект) // ВЯ. – №1. – 2008. – С. 37–65.

6. Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов. – М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2001. – 288 с.

7. Вежбицкая А. Семантика грамматики. – М.: Изд-во РАН, Институт научной информации по общественным наукам, 1992. – 31 с.

8. Вежбицкая А. Сопоставление культур через посредство лексики и прагматики. – М. : Языки славянской культуры, 2001. – 272 с.

9. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. – М.: Русские словари, 1996. – 411с.

10. Голубовская И.А. Этнические особенности языковых картин мира: Монография. – Киев: Издательстко-полиграфический центр "Киевский университет", 2002. – 293 с.

11. Горелов И.Н., Енгалычев В.Ф. Безмолвной мысли знак: Рассказы о невербальной коммуникации. – М., 1991.

12. Гришаева Л.И., Цурикова Л.В. Введение в теорию межкультурной коммуникации: учеб. пособие для студ. лингв. фак.

высш. учеб. заведений. – М.: Издательский центр "Академия", 2007. – 336 с.

13. Грушевицкая Т.Г., Попков В.Д., Садохин А.П. Основы межкультурной коммуникации. – М., 2002.

14. Гудков Д.Б. Теория и практика межкультурной коммуникации. – М.: Гнозис, 2003. – 288с.

15. Гусева П.Т. О некоторых психологических аспектах интеркультурной коммуникации // Вісник Харківського національного університету. – Вип. 471. – Х.: Константа, 2000. – С. 57–63.

16. Дейк Т.А. Расизм и язык. – М., 1989.

17. Дмитриева Н.Л. Конвенциональный стереотип как средство регуляции восприятия вербализированного содержания. Автореф. дис…канд. филол. наук. – Барнаул, 1996. – 18 с.

18. Донец П.Н. О причинах "межкультурного поворота" в лингвистике и других гуманитарных дисциплинах // Вісник Харківського національного університету. – Вип. 471. – Харьков: Константа, 2000. – С. 83–88

19. Донец П.Н. Основы общей теории межкультурной коммуникации. – Харьков: Штрих, 2001. – 384с.

20. Захарова Ю.М. Англійська мова в сучасному ісламському світі // Мовні і концептуальні картини світу: Збірник наукових праць. – К.: Видавничий Дім Дмитра Бураго, 2004. – Вип. 11. Книга 1. – С. 136–142.

21. Захарова Ю.М.Інтонація наративів в англомовному дискурсі політиків країн арабського світу // Мовні і концептуальні картини світу: Збірник наукових праць. – К.: Вид-во "Логос", 2002. – Вип. 7. – С. 160–166.

22. Захарова Ю.М. Просодична інтерференція в англомовному дискурсі (експериментально-фонетичне дослідження мовлення арабо-англійських білінгвів): Автореф. дис… канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04 / Київський національний ун-т ім..Тараса Шевченка. – К., 2005. – 20 с.

23. Кабакчи В.В. Практика англоязычной межкультурной коммуникации. – СПб.: Издательство "Союз", 2001. – 480 с.

24. Карасик В.И. Язык социального статуса. – М.: Ин-т яз. РАН; Волгоград. гос. пед. ин-т, 1992. – 330 с.

25. Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. – М.: Наука, 1987. – 261 с.

26. Кацберт Т.Л. Вербалізація концепту "Європейська ідентичність" в європейському ареалі // Мовні і концептуальні картини світу: Збірник наукових праць. – № 21/2. – К.: КНУ, 2007. – С. 10–18.

27. Кацберт Т.Л. Національні стереотипии в англо-німецьких відносинах: лінгвокультурологічний аспект: Автореф. дис… канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04 / Київський національний ун-т. ім.Тараса Шевченка. – К., 2008. – 21 с.

28. Кацберт Т.Л. Публічні директиви як відображення культурних ознак мовних колективів // Мовні і концептуальні картини світу: Збірник наукових праць. – №10. – К.: КНУ, 2004. – С. 295–300.

29. Кацберт Т.Л. Стереотипізація свідомості в етнічних анекдотах європейських культур // Вісник Харківського національного ун-ту ім. В.Н.Каразіна. – №741. – Х.: ХНУ, 2006. – С. 165–169.

30. Кацберт Т.Л. Стереотипи та їх вплив на процесс міжкультурної комунікації // Сучасні дослідження в іноземній філології. – № 2. – Ужгородський національний ун-т, 2004. – С. 176–182.

31. Лебедева Н.М., Лунева О.В., Стефаненко Т.Г., Мартынова М.Ю. Межкультурный диалог. Тренинг этнокультурной компетентности. – М., 2003.

32. Левицький А.Е., Святюк Ю.В. Етрономінації у дзеркалі міжкультурної комунікації. – Київ: ЛОГОС, 2011. – 192 с.

33. Леонтович О.А. Введение в межкультурную коммуникацию: Учебное пособие. – М.: Гнозис, 2007. – 368 с.

34. Мантатов В.В. Проблема текста и его понимания // Логика и язык. – М., 1985. – С. 28–38.

35. Манфред Ю. Социолингвистика. – Киев: Вища школа, 1987. – 200 с.

36. Мартынова М.Ю., Тишков В.А., Лебедева Н.М. Лекции по проблемам межэтнического и межконфессионального взаимодействия. – М., 2003.

37. Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика: учеб. пособие. – 2-е издание. – Минск: тетрасисемс, 2005. – 255 с.

38. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология: Учеб. пособие для студентов вузов. – М.: Academia, 2001. – 204 с.

39. Маслова В.А. Русская поэзия ХХ века. Лингвокультурологический взгляд: Учеб. пособие. – М.: Высшая школа, 2006. – 256 с.

40. Мовленнєві жанри в міжкультурній комунікації: монографія/авт.кол.: Р.Помірко, Ф.Бацевич, А.Паславська та ін.. – Львів: ПАІС, 2010. – 280 с.

41. Садохин А.П. Введение в теорию межкультурной коммуникации. – М.: Высшая школа, 2005. – 310 с.

42. Солощук Л.В. Вербальні і невербальні компоненти комунікації в англомовному дискурсі. – Х.: Константа, 2006. – 300 с.

43. Сукувата В. Ґендер і релігія // Основи теорії ґендеру. – Київ: К.І.С., 2004. – С.385-425.

44. Тер-Минасова С.Г. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация. – М.: Слово, 2000. – 624 с.

45. Шиманович Г.М. Когнітивні чинники еволюції назв осіб в англійській мові ХХ століття: Автореф.дис…канд.філол.наук: 10.02.04 / Київський національний ун-т ім. Тараса Шевченка. – К., 2005. – 20 с.

46. Юсупов И.М. Психология взаимопонимания. – Казань, 1991.

47. Язык и культура: Факты и ценности: К 70-летию Юрия Сергеевича Степанова / Отв.ред. Е.С.Кубрякова, Т.Е.Янко. – М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2001. – 600 с.

48. Ялом, Ирвин. Лечение от любви и другие психотерапевтические новеллы. – М.: Независимая фирма "Класс", 2007. – 288 с.

49. Acton W.R., Walker de Felix J. Acculturaltion and Mind // Culture Bound. Bridging the cultural gap in language learning. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 20–32.

50. Agar M. Language Shock / Understanding the Culture of Communication. – William New York: Morrow and Company, 1993. – 285 p.

51. Alexeyeva I. Aspects of cultural difference and their realisation in language // Мова і культура. Матеріали конференції. – Вип. 5. – Т. III. – Ч. I. – К.: Видавничий Дім Дмитра Бураго, 2002. – С. 251–256.

52. Alexeyeva I. Islam and West Through Language Perspective // Сучасні дослідження з іноземної філології. – Ужгород, 2004. – Вип. 2. – С. 118–123.

53. Alexeyeva I. "Stumbling-blocks" in cross-cultural oral and written communication// Мова і культура. Матеріали конференції (Київ, 23-27 червня) – Київ, 2003. – Вип. 6. – Т. IV. – С. 123–130.

54. Alexeyeva I. What Western Stereotypes does the Headscarf Issue Reveal? // Мова і культура. Матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції (Київ, 28 червня – 2 липня) – Київ, 2004. – Вип. 7. – Т. V. – С. 123–127.

55. Archer C. Culture bump and beyond // Culture Bound. Bridging the cultural gap in language learning. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 170–178.

56. Barro A., Jordan S., Roberts C. Cultural practice in everyday life: the language learner as ethnographer // Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective. Approaches through drama and ethnography. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 76–97.

57. Bausinger H. Volkskunde. – Tubingen, 1999.

58. Bennett M.J. Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication. Selected Readings. – Yarmouth, 1998.

59. Bialistok E. Towards an explanation of second language acquisition // Language and understanding. – Oxford University Press, 1995. – C. 115–138.

60. Boas F. Language and Thought // Culture Bound. Bridging the cultural gap in language learning. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 5–7.

61. Bohannan L. Shakespeare in the Bush. Applying Cultural Anthropology. – Mayfield Publishing Company, 1991.

62. Brislin R.W. Understanding Culture's Influence on Behavior. – Fort Worth Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1993.

63. Brown H.D. Learning a second culture//Culture Bound. Bridging the cultural gap in language learning. Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 33–48.

64. Byram M., Cain A. Civilisation/Cultural Studies: an experiment in French and English schools // Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective. Approaches through Drama and Ethnography. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 32–44.

65. Carroll R. Cultural Misunderstandings // The French American Experience – University of Chicago Press, 1988.

66. Coleman J.A. Evolving Intercultural Perceptions among University Language Learners in Europe // Language Learning in Inter-

cultural Perspective. Approaches through drama and ethnography. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 45–75.

67. Condon J.C. "…So near the United States"//Culture Bound. Bridging the cultural gap in language learning. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 85–93.

68. Gupta, Akhil, Ferguson, James. Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology. – Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.

69. De Jong W. Open Frontiers. Teaching English in an intercultural context. – Oxford: Heinemann, 1996. – 118 p.

70. Delhees K. Soziale Kommunikation. Psychologische Grundlagen fur das Miteinander in der modernen Gesellschaft. – Opladen, 1994.

71. English across Cultures, Cultures across English. A Reader in Cross-cultural Communication/Ed.Garcia, Ofelia, Otheguy, Ricardo. – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1989. – 492p.

72. Fatehi K. International Management: A Cross-Cultural and Functional Perspective. Upper Saddle River. – N.Y., 1996.

73. Fox, Kate. Watching the English. – London: Hodder, 2004. – 424 p.

74. Geertz, Clifford.The Interpretation of Culture: Selected Essays. – New York: Basic, 1973.

75. Giddens A. Introduction to Sociology. 2nd edition. – N.Y., London: WW Norlon & Company, 1996. – 460 p.

76. Goleman D. Emotional Intelligence. – L.: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 1996. – 353 p.

77. Goodenough W.H. Cultural anthropology and linguistics // Garvin P.L. (Ed.) // Report on the Seventh Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Study. – Washington, D.C., 1957.

78. Gore K. Networking Cultural Knowledge. An interactive and experiential strategy to apply intercultural communication in business. – Helsinki: WSOY Oppimateriaalit Oy, 2007. – 183 p.

79. Griswold, Wendy. Cultures and Societies in a Changing World. – Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2004.

80. Hall 1998 a – Hall E. The Dance of Life. – N.Y., 1998.

81. Hall 1998 b – Hall E. The Hidden Dimension. – N.Y., 1998.

82. Hall, E.T. Beyond Culture. – N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1989. – 298 p.

83. Hall, E.T. The Silent Language. – N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1990. – 209 p.

84. Hall B.J. Among Cultures. – Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadworth, 2005.

85. Hall E., Hall M. Hidden Differences. Studies in international Communication. How to communicate with Germans. – Hamburg, 1983.

86. Heider F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. – N.Y., 1958.

87. Herbert G.J., Fernandez R.D. A Challenge to the Puerto Rican Community: An Untold Story of the AIDS Epidemic // Understanding Cultural Diversity. Culture, Curriculum, and Community Nursing. – London: Jones & Bartlett, 2000. – P.253-261.

88. Herskovits M. Cultural Relativism. – N.Y., 1972.

89. Herskovits M. Les bases de l'antropologie culturelle. – P., 1967.

90. Hewstone M., Jaspars J. Social dimensions of attribution // The social dimension. – Cambridge, 1984.

91. Hirsh E.D., Jr. Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know). – NY: First Vintage Books Edition, 1988. – 253 p.

92. Hirsh E.D., Kett F., Trefil J. Dictionary of cultural literacy. – Boston – NY, 1993. – 619 p.

93. Hofstede G. Culture and Organizations (Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival). Software of the Mind. – L., 1991.

94. Hofstede G. Interkulturelle Zusammenarbiet. Kulturen – Organisationen – Mangement. – Wiesbaden, 1993.

95. Jeffries L. Meaning in English. An Introduction to Language Studies. – L.: Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1998. – 267p.

96. Joho K.A., Ormsby A.A. Walk in Beauty: Strategies for Providing Culturally Competent Nursing Care to Native Americans // Understanding Cultural Diversity. Culture, Curriculum, and Community Nursing. – London: Jones & Bartlett Publishers, 2000. – P. 209–218.

97. Kelley H. Attribution in Social Psychology. – Lincoln, 1967.

98. Kidd, Warren. Culture and Identity. – New York: Palgrave, 2002. – 227 p.

99. Kluckhohn F., Strodbeck F.L. Variations in Value Orientations. – Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson, 1961.

100. Kohler –Haering P. Drei Kameraden – und kein Ende? // Das Wort. Germanistisches Jahrbuch. – GUS – BRD, 1994. – S. 183–190.

101. Kramsch, C. Language and Culture. – Oxford University Press, 1998. – 134 p.

102. Kramsch C. The Privilege of the Intercultural Speaker // Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective. Approaches through drama and ethnography. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 16–31.

103. Kroeber A.L., Klukhohn C. Culture. A critical review of concepts and definitions // Harvard University Papers. – 1952. – Vol. XLVII, #1.

104. Lado, Robert. Linguistics across cultures. Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers. – The University of Michigan, 1990. – 141p.

105. Lado R. How to compare two cultures // Culture Bound. Bridging the Cultural Gap in Language Learning. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 52–63.

106. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – University of Chicago Press, 1980.

107. Language and Understanding // Ed. By G.Brown, K.Malmkjar, A.Pollitt, J.Williams. – Oxford University Press, 1995. – 208 p.

108. Levine R. A Geography of Time. – N.Y.: Basic Books, 1997.

109. Lixian J., Cortazzi M. The Culture the Learner Brings: a Bridge or a Barrier? // Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective. Approaches through Drama and Ethnography. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 98–118.

110. Locke J.L. Why we don't talk to each other anymore. – New York: Touchstone, 1998. – 262 p.

111. Lyons J. Language and Linguistics. – Cambridge University Press, 1981.

112. Marsen S. Communication Studies. – NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. – 210 p.

113. Martin J., Nakayama Th. Intercultural communication in contexts. – London, Toronto, 2000.

114. Mead, George H. A Reader// ed.by F.C.Silva Routledge. – N.Y., 2011.

115. Moraine G.G. Kinesics and Cross-Cultural Understanding // Culture Bound. Bridging the Cultural Gap in Language Learning. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 64–77.

116. Osterloh K.-H. Intercultural differences and communicative approach to foreign-language teaching in the third world // Culture Bound. Bridging the cultural gap in language learning. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 77–84.

117. O'Sullivan, K. Understanding Ways: Communicating Between Cultures. – Sydney: Hale & Iremonger Pty Limited, 1994. – 145 p.

118. Salmond S.W. Culture Learning and Unlearning: Creating a Culture Supporting the Development of Transcultural Nurse Managers // Understanding Cultural Diversity. Culture, Curriculum, and Community Nursing. – London: Jones&Bartlett Publishers, 2000. – P. 149–160.

119. Parker O.D. Cultural clues to the Middle Eastern student // Culture Bound. Bridging the cultural gap in language learning. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P. 94–101.

120. Richard – Amato P.A., Snow M.A. The Multicultural Classroom. – N.Y., 1992.

121. Riley P. Social Identity and Intercultural Communication // Levende Talen, 443, 1989. – P. 488–493.

122. Roth, Klaus, Roth, Juliana. Intercultural Communication as Applied Ethnology and Folklore // Journal of Folklore Research. Volume: 36. Issue: 2/3. – 1999.

123. Samovar L., Porter F. Intercultural Communication: A Reader. – Belmont, 1994.

124. Singer M.R. Culture: A Perceptual Approach// Readings in Intercultural Communication. – Pittsburgh Regional Council for International Education, 1971. – P. 6–20.

125. Stark, Rodney. Sociology: Tenth Edition. – Belmont, CA: Thomson Learning, Inc., 2007.

126. Tibi B. Islam between Culture and Politics. – NY: Palgrave, 2001. – 271 p.

127. Triandis H.S. Culture and social behavior. – N.Y., 1994.

128. Walton C.C. The Moral Manager. – N.Y., 1988.

129. Wierzbicka, Anna. Meaning and Culture. – Oxford University Press, 2006. – 352 p.

130. Winkelman, Michael. Teaching about Culture Shock//Anthropology News. – Vol.32, Issue 4. – 1991. – P. 1–38.

131. Wolfson, N. Compliments in cross-cultural perspective // Culture Bound. Bridging the cultural gap in language learning. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – P.112-120.

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

1. АБЛ – Акунин Б. "Левиафан". – М.: Захаров, 2001. – 320 с.

2. АМВНД – Арбатова М. Визит нестарой дамы: Вполне роман. – М.: АСТ: АСТ МОСКВА, 2008. – 285 с.

3. АММЗЖ – Арбатова М. Меня зовут женщина. – М.: ЗАО Изд-во ЭКСМО-Пресс, 1999. – 464 с.

4. ГМЄ – Гретковська М. Європейка. – К.: Нора-Друк, 2006. – 320 с.

5. ДИБ – Дива из будущего // Корреспондент. – №15 (304). – 2008. – С. 80–82.

6. З – Заграница. – 2004. – № 33 (242)

7. МВОА – Маяковский В. Об Америке. – М.: Советский писатель, 1949.

8. ПАЛ – Пражская, Александра. Любовник made in Europe. – М.: Гелеос, 2008. – 320 с.

9. ПСНПЧ – Пиркало С. Не думай про червоне. – Київ: Видво ФАКТ, 2006. – 360 с.

10. ТПКТ – Теру, Пол. Коулун Тонг. – Москва: Иностранка; Б.С.Г. – ПРЕСС, 2002.

11. CSYNM – Clarke, Stephen. A Year in the Merde. – London: Black Swan, 2005. – 383p.

12. FHBJD – Fielding H. Bridget Jones's Diary. – London: Picador, 1996. – 310 p.

13. GEEPL – Gilbert E. Eat. Pray. Love. – Penguin Books, 2007. – 445 p.

14. GETLAM – Gilbert E. The Last American Man. – London, Berlin,NYL: Bloomsbury, 2009. –268p.

15. JHA – James H. The American. – London: Penguin Books, 1995. – 325p.

16. PAH – Parks, A. Husbands (is one ever enough?). – London: Penguin Books, 2005. – 473 p.

17. SALM – Srivastava, A. Looking for Maya. – London: Quartet Books, 2000. – 220 p.

18. WOPDG – Wilde O. The picture of Dorian Gray. – London: Penguin Books, 1994. – 256 p.

CONTENTS

Алєксєєва Ірина Олексіївна

ВСТУП ДО ТЕОРІЇ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

Підручник