

СЕКЦІЯ 5. МІЖКУЛЬТУРНА КОМУНІКАЦІЯ

Shaparenko O. V.

*Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of Law, Psychology and
Modern European Languages Department*

Kharkiv Trade and Economic Institute of
Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics
Kharkiv, Ukraine

INTERCULTURAL AND CROSSCULTURAL COMMUNICATION DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic social distancing has become a universal experience, forcing the mankind to face new challenges, but at the same time bringing people closer in some ways than ever before. The work is aimed at viewing the latest developments of intercultural and crosscultural communication under the influence of the COVID-19 pandemic, pointing out both challenges and positive trends; finding out the efficient tools to measure the cultural differences and similarities. The aim is reached by the review of the scientific thought in the field of intercultural communication, current works and media data on impact of global lockdown on crosscultural communication.

First of all, the clarification of the terms «intercultural communication» and «crosscultural communication» should be undertaken, as these two notions are frequently confused or treated as synonyms. Basing on the thoughts of Lustig M. and Koester J., Mari D. González, «intercultural communication involves interactions among people from different cultures, while crosscultural communication is viewed as a field of study of intercultural behaviours (practices) of individuals» [6, p. 199].

The relevance of the problem lies in the fact that though intercultural and crosscultural communication have been vastly researched already, humanity never encountered such a total isolation before the start of social distancing. This is absolutely a new experience for us.

The issues of intercultural communication have been studied by such theorists as William Gudykunst, Guo-Ming Chen and William Starosta who contributed to creation of intercultural communication theory [1; 2]. Intercultural communication competence was researched by Young-Yun Kim, Myron W. Lustig and Jolene Koester [3; 4]. Fred Casmir viewed connections between culture, communication, and education that led him to the idea of the third-culture building in the result of shift for international and intercultural communication [5]. Danielle Cliche and Andreas Wiesand examined the ways of improving cross-cultural communication through the

Arts and Culture [8]. E. Hall, D. Wunderlich, X. Bausinger, D. Kruche, J. Bolten considered the problems of language integration in the context of intercultural communication [7].

According to Bakhov I. S., the term «intercultural communication» is considered from the standpoint of three approaches:

- the concept of structural functionalism, based on the classical positivist methodology, and exploring a systematic method; the concept of the information society, represented by D. Bell, A. Toffler. The ontology of communication in this approach is based on system connections and functions;

- non-classical methodological approach proposed by J. Habermas, based on a cognitive model of subject-object relations, in which the sphere of communication is distinguished as a special ontological object. Its study relies on the methods of hermeneutic interpretation of meanings, critical reflection, rational reconstruction;

- post-classical approach, which reduces the nature of the social to the subject-object relations, suggests the principle of intersubjectivity, and excludes objectivity. This approach is traced in the works of N. Luhmann. Society is seen as a network of communications, and communications create an opportunity for the «self-recording» of society and its «self-reproduction» [7]. Communication is seen as an active, self-organizing environment.

In our opinion, intercultural communication during social distancing is a self-reproducing, constantly changing systematical interaction of people and artificial intelligence in the information field with certain changes of intercultural behaviours (crosscultural changes) of individuals.

In fact, during the pandemic, intercultural communication is almost entirely based on and restricted by IT connections (social networks, online platforms of educational institutions, shops, mobile applications and services, etc.), with extensive use of regularly updated artificial intelligence products, chatbots. According to the UNESCO data, 91% of all students are being online while COVID-19 pandemic [11]. But such restrictions gave impulse to community engagement and positive crosscultural developments, some universal symbols have been adopted to bring communities together and to break cultural barriers. Emerging «Namaste» greeting, hailing from Hindu culture, is a bright example of the trend. It became a popular alternative to handshakes with world leaders and members of the British Royal Family, and HRH Prince Charles in particular. «Namaste» translates as «I bow to the divine in you», which gives stronger meaning than the handshake. It might «be spread more widely in the future, as our concepts of hygiene and physical distancing are changing» [12].

Besides, there are multiple cases of universal symbols being used to convey messages. For example, people are putting images of rainbows in the windows of their homes to spread colour and positivity which are understood by humans, not necessarily speaking the same language. Creating these images has proved to be a good way to keep people occupied and creative, it has also become a symbol of sympathy and care. The national round of

applause for the NHS doctors that took place across the UK has been another example of new intercultural behaviours (practices) of individuals [12]. Intercultural Cities: COVID-19 Special page informs about global character of intercultural engagements:

«The city of Pavlograd (Ukraine) has launched the «Intercultural Cuisine on-line» which hosts step-by-step videos and recipes of dishes from different cultures. Melitopol (Ukraine) has engaged children with diverse background in the production of a video called «Stay at home». Shared through the city's website, children raise awareness within their communities and share several games that children and adults can play together during the quarantine. Cartagena (Spain) has supported a collaboratory videomaking project, together with other social entities. The project aims to encourage all neighbours with positive messages. The cities of Sumy (Ukraine) and Limassol (Cyprus) organised online meetings between their city councilors and civil society organisations to address the most important challenges faced by persons with different cultural background and migrant communities. The Leeds (UK) council have set up a network to monitor the impact of Covid-19 on communities of interest (groups of people who share an identity or experience such as refugees, asylum seekers, people with disabilities and, the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) community).

To respond to the increased need for social support, the City of Dudelange (Luxemburg) created a hotline where residents could receive responses to their questions. In the City of Salisbury (Australia), the network of Interfaith leaders has received telephone calls to check how their religious communities are doing and have been provided with translated information.

Dublin (Ireland) launched «Holding It Together Apart», a Community Development project aimed at helping people to maintain their physical, spiritual and mental wellbeing while isolated and at home with Covid-19 [10].

The examples above prove that being involved in online way of communicating, humans tend to demonstrate empathy and positiveness towards each other. Although, according to the Intercultural cities programme (ICC), administrated by the Council of Europe, some current challenges from an intercultural perspective are as follows: «threats to equality due to an increase in social inequalities; threats to positive interaction through the temptation of privileging individual solutions; threats to diversity through increase in racism, prejudice and stereotypes, and discriminatory practices; restrictions of human rights and fundamental freedoms [10].»

These threats urge the immediate response of scientists and practitioners. Mary Beth Lamb and Dr. Amy Tolbert suggest that «by looking through four key national and regional cultural lenses», we can gain «new insights into why countries are fighting the pandemic differently and perhaps why some countries are succeeding more quickly than others» [11]. According to them, these four intercultural frameworks include:

- 1) «Power Distance (PDI)», identifying type of the culture, whether egalitarian or hierarchical; culture's attitude to authority;

2) «Masculinity (MAS)», which does not refer to gender in this context, analyzing whether we, as a group (a culture, a country) value assertiveness, competition and winning or contentment and quality of life;

3) «Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI)», measuring how comfortable we are with the unknown; how carefully we assess risks before we act;

4) «Individualism (IDV)», reflecting whether the culture believes that its strength and national rights reside within the individual or its success stems from its collectivism and interdependency [11].

Such kind of analysis might assist in obtaining valuable data on cultural similarities and differences and working out efficient measures to eliminate obstacles to intercultural communication caused by the lockdown.

To sum up, changing forms of communication during social distancing has not restricted it; on the contrary, a number of efficient crosscultural practices have been employed, which might cause the revision of traditional ways of communicating and wide use of remote sorts of work, study, leisure activities after the quarantine. To gain better understanding of reasons of the countries' success and failures in fight with Covid-19 pandemic four intercultural frameworks might be used.

References:

1. Gudykunst W. Intercultural communication theory. Current perspectives. / W. Gudykunst // Newbury Park: Sage. – 1989. – 298 p.
2. Chen G., Starosta W. Foundations of intercultural communication. / G. Chen, W. Starosta // Boston: Allyn & Bacon. – 1998. – 340 p.
3. Kim Y. Intercultural communication competence: A systems-theoretic view. / William Gudykunst & Young-Yun Kim (Eds.), Readings on communicating with strangers. An approach to intercultural communication. // New York: McGraw Hill. – 1992. – P. 371-381.
4. Myron W. Lustig, Koester J. Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication Across Cultures / W. Lustig Myron, J. Koester. – Pearson; 5 edition. – June 4, 2005. – 400 p.
5. Casmir F. Third-culture building: A paradigm shift for international and intercultural communication / F. Casmir // Communication Yearbook, 16. – 1993. – P. 407-428.
6. Shaparenko O. V. Problems of intercultural communications in current Ukraine / Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Сер.: Філологія. 2015. – № 19, том 1. – P. 199-202, p. 199.
7. Бахов І. С. Міжкультурна комунікація в контексті глобалізаційного діалогу культур / І. С. Бахов // Вісник Національної академії Державної прикордонної служби України. – 2012. – Вип. 2. – Режим доступу: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Vnadps_2012_2_3
8. Cliche D., Wiesand A. IFACCA D'ART REPORT NO 39 / Achieving Intercultural Dialogue through the Arts and Culture? Concepts, Policies, Programmes, Practice // D. Cliche, A. Wiesand – DEC, 2009. – P. 18. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <https://ifacca.org/en/what->

- we-do/knowledge-data/reports/intercultural-dialogue-through-arts-and-culture/
9. González Mari D. Cross-cultural vs. Intercultural / Mari D. González [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://ixmaticcommunications.com/2011/02/03/cross-cultural-vs-intercultural/>
 10. Council o Europe. Intercultural Cities: COVID-19 Special page [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/interculturalcities/covid-19-special-page>
 11. Lamb M. Beth, Tolbert A. How Cultural Differences Impact Getting Global Results in the Covid 19 Pandemic / M. B. Lamb, A. Tolbert [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <https://culturalawareness.com/how-cultural-differences-impact-getting-global-results-in-the-covid-19-pandemic/>
 12. The Impact of COVID-19 On Cross-Cultural Communication. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <https://www.languageconnect.net/blog/impact-covid-19-cross-cultural-communication/>

Шелестіна М. Є.
викладач кафедри гуманітарних наук
Національний технічний університет
«Харківський політехнічний інститут»
м. Харків, Україна

ФОРМУВАННЯ І РОЗВИТОК КОМУНІКАТИВНИХ НАВИЧОК СТУДЕНТІВ-ІНОЗЕМЦІВ НА ПОЧАТКОВОМУ ЕТАПІ

Основними завданнями навчання іноземних студентів на початковому етапі є формування комунікативної компетентності, що дасть їм можливість задовольнити комунікативні потреби у ситуаціях щоденного спілкування, допоможе іноземним громадянам адаптуватися в іншомовному середовищі, та підготує їх до навчання у вищих навчальних закладах України.

Проблеми викладання української мови іноземним студентам були предметом наукових пошуків Л. Бей, О. Тростинської, Т. Єфімова, Т. Лагутіна, Г. Тохтар та ін. науковців; на проблемі навчання говорінню іноземців акцентувала увагу А. Чистякова; теоретико-методологічній основі комунікативного підходу до вивчення української мови як іноземної присвячені праці О. Гончарук, В. Вдовіна. У. В. Соловій зазначає, що будь-який рівень навчального процесу повинен базуватися на тісній взаємодії мовного, мовленнєвого та комунікативного елементів [1, с. 274].