RU

Различные подходы к определению понятия «межкультурная коммуникация» с позиций взаимодействия лингвокультурных сообществ

Крамаренко О. Л., Богданова О. Ю.

Аннотация. Цель исследования – определить общее и различное в понимании исследователями термина «межкультурная коммуникация». В статье рассматривается вопрос диалогического взаимодействия культур, в результате которого происходит процесс познания иной культурной реальности и сравнения её с собственной. Научная новизна работы заключается в формулировании определения «межкультурная коммуникация» с учетом анализа мнений различных исследователей в данной области науки. В результате исследования были выделены общие черты в трактовке термина межкультурной коммуникации: равноправное взаимодействие представителей различных лингвокультур; артефакт одной культуры становится метапродуктом заимствующей культуры; диалогический характер межкультурной коммуникации.

EN

Different Approaches to Definition of "Intercultural Communication" Concept from the Standpoint of Linguocultural Communities' Interaction

Kramarenko O. L., Bogdanova O. Y.

Abstract. The study aims at determining the general and the different in the researchers' understanding of the term "intercultural communication". The article considers the issue of cultures dialogical interaction, as a result of which there is a process of different culture learning and comparing it with their own. The research scientific novelty lies in the formulation of the "intercultural communication" concept taking into account the analysis of different researchers' opinions. The attained results have identified the general features of "intercultural communication" definitions: equal interaction between representatives of different linguistic cultures; the artifact of one culture becoming a metaproduct of the borrowing culture; the dialogical nature of intercultural communication.

Introduction

The concept of intercultural communication came into use of specialists in ethnography, psychology, cultural studies, linguistics, theory and practice of teaching foreign languages at the end of the 19th century and received significant development during the 20th century [5]. The study relevance of the presented article is determined by the relations between the intercultural communication phenomenon and the interlanguage communication features which reflect the originality of the particular people's national mentality. According to G. G. Galich, one of the most important world linguistic picture aspects is the value system characteristic of a given culture, supported and preserved in its language [Ibidem].

According to the main objective of the article, the authors have set up the following tasks:
1) to consider different approaches to defining the concept of intercultural communication;
2) to determine the value of cultural identity in intercultural communication;
3) to single out the common features of intercultural communication definitions.

The practical value of the work is due to the possibility of using the research results in the courses of higher educational institutions in lexicology, lexicography, culture studies, theory and practice of intercultural communication, as well as in the compilation of educational dictionaries of various types. For this reason, the authors of this article consider it important and necessary to present the research materials in English based on the translation of some theoretical statements taken from the article by O. L. Kramarenko [15] including some additions.

To solve the set tasks, the article uses the following research methods: the method of comparative analysis, the method of linguistic description, the method of lexicographic analysis by L. P. Stupin [23] and O. M. Karpova [11], theoretical provisions of dictionaries parametric analysis by Yu. N. Karaulov [10]. The study material is the approaches of different researchers to the definition of "intercultural communication" concept.

The theoretical background of this work is the modern theory of intercultural communication, linguistic and cultural theory of the word, theoretical provisions of lexicographic portraitization and typification by Yu. D. Apresyan [1], as well as a number of ideas for the lexicographic representation of culturally marked lexical units by M. S. Kolesnikova [13] and O. M. Karpova [11].

Different approaches to defining the concept of intercultural communication

The foundations of intercultural communication as a new scientific approach were outlined after the Second World War in the USA in connection with the creation of the Institute for Service Abroad, which trains specialists professionally adopted in foreign cultures, under the leadership of Edward Hall [9, c. 106]. Practical needs for intercultural communication have arisen because of the rapid economic development of many countries and regions, radical changes in technology, associated with globalization of economic activity.

Currently, there are three main approaches to intercultural communication in American communication theory:

1. *Social science*, based on psychological data and aimed at describing and predicting the behavior of communicants.

2. *Interpretive*, proceeding from the postulate that culture is created and maintained through human activity and emphasizing the need to study communication in context-sensitive manner.

3. *Critical*, founded on the perception of culture as a sphere of the struggle for power and taking into account the economic and political factors affecting culture and communication [17, c. 12-13].

In Russia, scientific research is carried out in the field of intercultural communication theory mainly in the following areas, which are based on the idea of the relationship between language and culture:

1. *Linguistic and culture studies*, which is a valuable source of information reflecting the interaction of language and culture.

2. *Ethnolinguistics*, which studies language in the context of its relationship with ethnicity.

3. *Cultural linguistics*, which describes the correspondence between language and culture in their synchronous interaction [Ibidem, c. 17-18].

Ideas put forward by comparative linguistics, ethnopsycholinguistics, ethnography, ethnosemantics, cross-cultural pragmatics, linguistic sociopsychology, studies of mechanisms of understanding, description of national-specific features of the linguistic picture of the world, the concept of a linguistic personality, the concept and problems of the speech sphere, research on communication, the relationship between consciousness and communication, etc. become of importance for intercultural communication [17, c. 18-19; 18, c. 18].

Some researchers propose to interpret the term "intercultural communication" in a broad sense – as human communication with God, man and nature, dialogue between the individual and society, communication between healthy and sick people, etc. as the whole range of possible communications, justifying such a lengthy interpretation by the fact that this term is used to describe an unstable, chaotic, open, constantly renewing, self-organizing and unpredictable modern world [9, c. 108].

S. M. Kulaeva understands intercultural communication as "equal cultural interaction of various linguocultural communities' representatives, taking into account their originality, which leads to the need of identifying the universal and specific on the basis of comparing other and their own cultures" [16, c. 67].

S. Ya. Podoprigora and T. G. Perville define intercultural communication as the interaction of systems in which an artifact undergoes qualitative changes – it turns into another form of development, receives a new look and new function [21, c. 16]. When one culture borrows an artifact from another, it becomes the property of the borrowing culture only in a revised form, enriched with new content, and receives the name of a *metaproduct* [Ibidem].

D. B. Gudkov understands intercultural communication as communication between representatives of various linguocultural communities. The scientist notes that a prerequisite for successful communication is the presence of general knowledge of the communication participants, including knowledge of the code and extra-code knowledge (i.e. knowledge that goes beyond the language and is determined by a certain culture). The knowledge of each of the communication participants is divided into four groups: individual, social, national, universal. These groups are not equivalent to ensure adequate intercultural communication: universal knowledge, due to its well-knownness, does not play a decisive role in communication, individual knowledge, due to its singularity, cannot be generalized, presupposes incalculable variability, and therefore cannot be an object of theoretical analysis. Thus, the national and social knowledge of the communication participants plays a decisive role in ensuring adequate intercultural communication, the border between which is very difficult to draw [7, c. 39-41].

To achieve mutual understanding between the subjects of communication, the dialogical character of intercultural relations acquires special significance, since this type of interaction allows one to go beyond own culture, to discover the diversity of national cultures with their uniqueness of life experience [3, c. 37-38; 20, c. 14; 21, c. 25].

V. P. Furmanova puts the following content into the "cultures interaction" concept:

1. Cultures interaction unfolds on the basis of different cultural reality cognition and presupposes the development of cultural concepts system that is most essential for the life of a given nation.

2. Teaching a foreign language is based not only on external, but also on internal dialogue, which allows the implicit comparison of cultures to be made explicit, which gives students the opportunity to see their culture through the prism of other models, forms of thinking and develop a certain ethnomethodological view that allows them to understand their own culture [24, c. 42-43].

Speaking about the cultures interaction, M. A. Tsareva considers such problems as mutual understanding, mentality, the relationship between culture and language, emotional attitude to the fact of a foreign culture. According to M. A. Tsareva, mutual understanding is a multidimensional phenomenon, which includes the sociological aspect as awareness of the community, the dependence of one culture on another, the socio-cultural aspect, the value aspect as awareness and understanding of the values of another culture, and the psychological aspect. Only a comprehensive implementation of the four above-mentioned aspects ensures mutual understanding between representatives of different cultural communities [26, c. 45].

In the process of intercultural communication, each person simultaneously solves two problems – he is included in a foreign culture and strives to preserve his cultural identity, that is, to realize his belonging to some sociocultural group, and determine his place in the socio-cultural space, and freely navigate the surrounding world [12, c. 145]. The need for identity is associated with the fact that each person strives for a certain order in his life, which is provided only by community of other people. Thus, a person needs to accept the elements of consciousness, tastes, prevailing in this community, habits, norms, values, and other means of interconnection adopted among others. The assimilation of this or that group social life elements gives an orderly and predictable character to a person's life and makes them involved in the appropriate culture. In this regard, a person understands his "*I*" through the prism of cultural characteristics adopted in a given society, he self-identifies himself with the cultural models of this particular society [14, c. 70].

Cultural identity in intercultural communication

Determining the importance of cultural identity in intercultural communication, Zh. A. Verkhovskaya notes that identity is a prerequisite for the formation of certain stable qualities of an individual, due to which they have feelings of sympathy or antipathy towards certain cultural phenomena or people, which ultimately determines the type, manner, and form of communication [4, c. 5-6]. A person has several identities at once, since he is simultaneously a member of different socio-cultural groups; taken together, they reflect his gender, ethnic and religious affiliation, professional status, etc. In connection with the above, Zh. A. Verkhovskaya understands intercultural communication as the relationship of opposing identities, in which the identities of communication partners interact. As a result of this interaction, the unknown and unfamiliar in the partner's identity becomes familiar and understandable, which allows us to expect appropriate behavior from an individual. The interaction of identities simplifies the coordination of relations in communication, determines its type and mechanism, defines certain topics of communication and speech styles as appropriate or unacceptable. The diversity of ethnic identities can simultaneously become an obstacle for intercultural communication [Ibidem, c. 7].

In intercultural communication, the problem of cultural identity is based on the division of all cultures' representatives into *Us versus Them* [22]. This raises the question of where the border is dividing a culture that a person considers "*Us*" and cultures that are different to him. "*Us*" is the culture with which a person is connected by his origin, place of residence, upbringing, the language in which he speaks and thinks, the traditions that are preserved in his memory [2, c. 200]. At the same time, much depends on the person himself, on his hopes, goals and ideals, on everything that he considers important and necessary for him. In the culture we inherited from the past, we may not be satisfied with different things and even reject some phenomena, while in other culture we can find something interesting and useful for us [4, c. 8-10]. Thus, the border between our own and foreign culture is established not only by circumstances beyond our control, but also by our free choice; this border is not always easy to recognize [Ibidem, c. 10]. The concept of "*Them*" arises when a person is faced with value systems and norms of behavior that are significantly different from those that are accepted in one's native culture. Thus, in the broadest sense, "*Them*" means everything that is beyond the bounds of the self-evident, familiar, and known [8]. The opposite concept of "*Us*" implies that circle of the surrounding world phenomena, which is perceived as familiar, taken for granted [4, c. 11].

Zh. A. Verkhovskaya expresses the idea that comprehending "*Us*" and "*Them*" includes: 1) comprehending "*Us*" against the background of "*Them*"; 2) "defamiliarisation" of "*Us*" and giving "personal" to "*Them*". The author notes that the possibilities of comprehending "*Us*" and "*Them*" in culture are associated with the nature of the cultures that form the national cultural world, which is a part of the real world [Ibidem, c. 14].

Thus, the above features can be reduced to the following definition: intercultural communication is an equal dialogical interaction of representatives of different linguocultures based on the awareness of their own identity, which makes it possible to learn a different cultural reality in comparison with their own, which makes it possible to understand their culture through the prism of other samples and presupposes the possession of communicants' common linguistic and sociocultural code.

Common features of intercultural communication definitions

Intercultural communication as a process of intercultural interaction has both positive and negative consequences. On the one hand, this process contributes to cultural rapprochement between peoples through intercultural

communication and knowledge. On the other hand, it is often necessary to revise or abandon some of the traditional values of their own culture, which can lead to the loss of cultural identity [Ibidem, с. 16-18].

Communication acts as a way of organizing forward and backward links between local subsystems of culture, individuals within one culture, or at the level of intercultural communication, as well as between different cultures and even between cultures of different times. However, "it is possible to talk about intercultural communication only if its participants represent different cultures and are aware of all cultural phenomena that do not belong to their culture as '*Them*'. Relations are intercultural if the participants in the communication process not only resort to their own traditions, customs, ideas and ways of behavior, but also at the same time get acquainted with the '*Them*' culture" [24, с. 89; 25, с. 65].

However, with all the variety of definitions of intercultural communication, there are common features noted by most authors:

- intercultural communication presupposes equal interaction between representatives of different linguistic cultures, a necessary condition for which is the awareness of their own identity and originality;

- in the process of intercultural communication, an artifact of one culture, enriching itself with new content and undergoing qualitative changes, becomes a metaproduct of another, borrowing, culture;

- intercultural communication presupposes the dialogical nature of relations, which allows, on the one hand, to know a different cultural reality in comparison with one's own, and on the other hand, gives the opportunity to know native culture through the prism of other models;

- successful intercultural communication presupposes not only the communication participants' possession of a common linguistic code, but also the common meaning attached to linguistic signs.

Representatives of different cultures constantly face serious communication problems associated with mismatch, and sometimes a conflict of norms, values, stereotypes of consciousness and behavior. This mismatch gives rise to cultural communication barriers, the most obvious of which are the linguistic and semantic barriers arising from language differences. Communication is only possible if communication participants own a common code. However, only common language is not enough for adequate communication. Community of appropriated culture and community of mental images are also needed by communicants [6; 19, с. 91].

Conclusion

Having considered different approaches to defining the concept of intercultural communication, we come to the following conclusions:

1) the variety of "intercultural communication" definitions shows that the phenomenon "intercultural communication" is a complex multidimensional process, the effectiveness of which depends on the adequate solution of a whole range of problems. These problems include mutual understanding and the willingness of communication participants to realize the values and interdependence of different cultures. Adequate intercultural communication is provided by national and social knowledge, in which the contradictions of the intercultural communicative process appear due to various communication barriers. The problem of common national and social knowledge becomes a key problem in teaching a foreign language from the standpoint of intercultural communication;

2) identity of different cultures representatives is impossible. Only a larger or smaller area of their intersection is possible which provides an opportunity for communication. But complete misunderstanding also turns out to be impossible due to the universality of certain aspects of human experience, which makes it possible to find a common language for representatives of different cultures. It is the possession of cognitive basis knowledge and ideas that allows to navigate in the cultural space of the target language and act according to its rules, and takes on special significance from the standpoint of intercultural communication in the process foreign language teaching;

3) the concept of intercultural communication, which appeared in the 19th century, received significant development in the 20th century due to the practical needs of society, primarily in the United States. In Russia, this branch of knowledge is in the process of formation, due to which the researchers do not have a consensus on the unambiguous interpretation of the term "intercultural communication". There are common features of this phenomenon noted by most authors: equal interaction between representatives of different linguistic cultures; the artifact of one culture becomes a metaproduct of the borrowing culture; the dialogical nature of intercultural communication.

Further research perspectives in this scientific field are presented in the solution of different national and social knowledge problems with the help of dictionaries, since in lexicographic practice theoretical searches are embodied in the study of methods for identifying and semantizing cultural information contained in a word.

References

1. Апресян Ю. Д. Язык. Семиотика. Культура. Интегральное описание языка и системная лексикография. М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1995. 415 с.
2. Брюховская Л. Г. Язык как носитель этнокультурных норм // V Житниковские чтения: Межкультурные коммуникации в когнитивном аспекте: материалы Всерос. науч. конф. Челябинск: Челяб. гос. ун-т, 2001. С. 200-203.

3. Васильева Н. Н. Межкультурная компетентность как продукт «диалога культур» // Актуальные проблемы преподавания иностранных языков в свете международных стандартов и межкультурной коммуникации: тезисы докладов преподавателей на Городской научно-практической конференции, посвященной 70-летию РГЭУ. Ростов н/Д: Рост. гос. эконом, ун-т, 2001. С. 37-39.

4. Верховская Ж. А. Межкультурная коммуникация: проблемы и противоречия. М.: МАКС Пресс, 2006. 36 с.

5. Галич Г. Г. Некоторые аспекты современной науки о языке как средстве межкультурной коммуникации // Межкультурная коммуникация: материалы Международной научно-практической конференции (16-18 октября 2002 г.). Омск: Омск. гос. ун-т, Фак. иностр. яз., Лингв. центр ОмГУ, 2002. С. 7-8.

6. Грушевицкая Т. Г., Попков В. Д., Садохин А. П. Основы межкультурной коммуникации: учебник для вузов. М.: ЮНИТИ-ДАНА, 2002. 352 с.

7. Гудков Д. Б. Межкультурная коммуникация: лекционный курс для студентов РКИ. М.: Изд-во МГУ, 2000. 120 с.

8. Донец П. Н. Сигналы «чужого» в межкультурной коммуникации // Межкультурная коммуникация и проблемы национальной идентичности: сб. науч. тр. / редколл.: Струкова Т. Г. (отв. ред.) и др. Воронеж: Воронеж. гос. ун-т, 2002. С. 42-47.

9. Зинченко В. Г. Межкультурная коммуникация. От системного подхода к синергетической парадигме: учеб. пособие. М.: Флинта; Наука, 2007. 224 с.

10. Караулов Ю. Н. Лингвистическое конструирование и тезаурус литературного языка. М.: Наука, 1981. 366 с.

11. Карпова О. М. Лексикографические портреты словарей современного английского языка. Иваново: ИвГУ, 2004. 192 с.

12. Кваскова Е. В. Ментальный тип в английской культурной традиции // Межкультурная коммуникация: язык - культура - ментальность: сборник научных трудов / отв. ред. В. П. Фурманова. Саранск: ГОУ ВПО «Морд. гос. ун-т им. Н. П. Огарева», 2005. С. 145-148.

13. Колесникова М. С. Диалог культур в лексикографии: феномен лингвострановедческого словаря. Ярославль: Изд-во ЯГПУ, 2002. 392 с.

14. Коротких Г. И., Коротких Г. И. Социокультурный аспект обучения английскому языку в вузе // Межкультурная коммуникация: материалы Международной научно-практической конференции (16-18 октября 2002 г.). Омск: Омск. гос. ун-т, Фак. иностр. яз., Лингв. центр ОмГУ, 2002. С. 70-73.

15. Крамаренко О. Л. К вопросу об определении понятия «межкультурная коммуникация» // Сборник научных статей XVI Всероссийской с международным участием междисциплинарной научно-практической конференции / под общ. ред. Т. П. Курановой. Ярославль: Ярославский государственный педагогический университет им. К. Д. Ушинского, 2009. С. 422-427.

16. Кулаева С. М. Лингвострановедческий текст в межкультурной коммуникации // V Житниковские чтения: Межкультурные коммуникации в когнитивном аспекте. Челябинск: Челяб. гос. ун-т, 2001. С. 67-71.

17. Леонтович О. А. Введение в межкультурную коммуникацию: учеб. пособие. М.: Гнозис, 2007. 368 с.

18. Мастерских С. В. Роль сопоставительной лингвистики в решении проблем межкультурной коммуникации // Межкультурная коммуникация: материалы Международной научно-практической конференции (16-18 октября 2002 г.). Омск: Омск. гос. ун-т, Фак. иностр. яз., Лингв. центр ОмГУ, 2002. С. 18-19.

19. Острикова Г. Н. К вопросу о речевой коммуникации и языковой личности // Актуальные проблемы преподавания иностранных языков в свете международных стандартов и межкультурной коммуникации: тезисы докладов преподавателей на Городской научно-практической конференции, посвященной 70-летию РГЭУ. Ростов н/Д: Рост. гос. эконом. ун-т, 2001. С. 90-93.

20. Пищальникова В. А. Диалог культур как программа исследования когнитивных процессов в межкультурной коммуникации // Межкультурная коммуникация и перевод: материалы межвузовской конференции / сост.: Л. В. Темнова и др. М.: Московский открытый социальный ун-т; Ин-т языкознания РАН, 2002. С. 13-15.

21. Подопригора С. Я., Первиль Т. Г. Образование и межкультурная коммуникация. Ростов н/Д: Издательский центр ДГПУ, 2006. 161 с.

22. Савруцкая Е. П. Феномен коммуникации в современном мире // Актуальные проблемы теории коммуникации: совместный рецензируемый сборник кафедры политологии Санкт-Петербургского государственного политехнического университета и Координационного совета Российской коммуникативной ассоциации. СПб.: Изд-во СПбГУ, 2004. С. 75-85.

23. Ступин Л. П. Лексикография английского языка: учеб. пособие для студентов институтов и факультетов иностранных языков. М.: Высшая школа, 1985. 167 с.

24. Фурманова В. П. Межкультурная коммуникация и лингвокультуроведение в теории и практике обучения иностранным языкам. Саранск: Изд-во Мордов. ун-та, 1993. 124 с.

25. Халеева И. И. Подготовка переводчика как «вторичной языковой личности» (аудитивный аспект) // Тетради переводчика. М.: МГЛУ, 1999. Вып. 24. С. 63-72.

26. Царева М. А. Межкультурная коммуникация и диалог культур: монография. Хабаровск: Изд-во Дальневост. гос. гуманитар. ун-та, 2006. 62 с.

Информация об авторах | Author information

RU

Крамаренко Ольга Леонидовна[1], к. филол. н.
Богданова Оксана Юрьевна[2], к. филол. н.
[1, 2] Ярославское высшее военное училище противовоздушной обороны

EN

Kramarenko Olga Leonidovna[1], PhD
Bogdanova Oksana Yurievna[2], PhD
[1, 2] Yaroslavl Higher Military Institute of the Air Defense

[1] *petruper@mail.ru,* [2] *dictema@mail.ru*

Информация о статье | About this article