

4. Моченов А.В., Никулин С.С., Ниясов А.Г., Саввоитова М.Д. Словарь современного жаргона российских политиков и журналистов. – М.: Русский язык, 2003. – 384с.
5. Хабермас Ю. Моральное сознание и коммуникативное действие. – СПб.: Наука, 2000. – 243с.

СВЕДЕНИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ

Ірина Соболєва – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, докторант кафедри російського мовознавства і комунікативних технологій Луганського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка.

Наукові інтереси: соціолінгвістика, риторика, мова ЗМІ.

TWO DOMAINS IN CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION STUDIES TO THE SECOND LANGUAGE INTERCULTURAL TRANSFORMATION

Анжеліка СОЛОДКА (Миколаїв, Україна)

Стаття присвячена інтерпретації процесу вторинної мовної соціалізації у контексті кроскультурної комунікації. Вона включає вивчення її основних складових та принципів вивчення інтеркультурної трансформації як структурної теоретичної основи інтеркультурної мовної соціалізації, розробка якої відкриває можливості набуття соціокультурного знання у комплексі кроскультурних комунікативних контекстів.

The article is devoted to investigating two domains of studies in second language socialization processes. It includes studying of the basic tenets of intercultural transformation and provides some cross-cultural adaptation models.

As an interdisciplinary approach to the joint processes of enculturation and language acquisition, language socialization (LS), a very vigorous research paradigm, is located at the crossroads between anthropology, cross-cultural psychology, cross-cultural pragmatics and sociolinguistics. This domain of study grew out of concerns with the narrowness of child language acquisition theories in the 1960s and 1970s. It is rooted in the notion that novices across the life span are socialized into using language and socialized through language not only in the immediate/local discourse context but also in the context of historically and culturally grounded social beliefs, values, and expectations, that is, in socio-culturally recognized and organized practices associated with membership in a social group (Ochs E., Schieffelin B.).

In language socialization study, it is increasingly acknowledged that people not only experience their *primary language socialization* during childhood but continue to experience *secondary language socialization* throughout their lives as they enter new sociocultural contexts, join new communities of practice (e.g. a workplace, an educational program) (Lave J, Wagner E.), assume new roles in society, and/or acquire a new language. As E. Ochs . notes, any expert-novice interaction involves language socialization. This expansion in the realm of LS allows it to stretch beyond its initial research interests in first language acquisition into the fields of bilingualism, multilingualism and second language acquisition. While most of the pioneering studies of language socialization were conducted in small-scale societies or on relatively homogeneous monolingual communities (Heath S.), more and more recent and currently ongoing studies have begun to pay attention to the particularities of secondary language socialization processes within linguistically and socioculturally heterogeneous settings associated with contact between two or more languages and cultures (Schechter S., Bell J., Duff P., Langman J, Lotherington H., Poole D, Roy S.). Started only during the last ten years it has quickly become one of the most informative, sophisticated, and promising domains of second language acquisition inquiry (Watson-Gegeo K.).

To look into border-crossers' diverse patterns of adjustment or maladjustment to the new socio-cultural environment, the paradigm of cross-cultural communication has developed two broad domains of interests: the comparative examination of communicative similarities and differences across cultures, and the communicative adaptations made by individuals when they move between cultures.

The former, the preeminent line of inquiry in cross-cultural communication, attempts to link variations in communication behavior to cultural contexts. It provides the conceptual tools needed to understand culture, communication, and the ways in which culture influences communications. The latter is relatively a new area, which seeks to understand changes in individual communication behavior that are related to the process of acculturation and communicative interactions. Understanding the two domains in the literature of intercultural communication helps to comprehend daily events in the multicultural world from the depth of socio-cultural, especially cross-cultural level. Generally speaking, the first approach provides theoretical support to understand where cross-cultural misunderstanding occur, and how such misunderstanding can be

minimized in future intercultural encounters. The second approach provides cross-cultural adaptation models, which can serve as informative indexes to understand cross-cultural newcomers' dynamic status of intercultural transformation.

The Cross-cultural adaptation models

Although the above domains in intercultural communication can both contribute to the studies on second language socialization, the approach of cross-cultural adaptation is more compatible with that of language socialization. Its adaptational approach transcends the level of reasoning that tries to locate, and then avoid cross-cultural deviation, social ineptitude or existential crises. Instead, it suggests the notion that it is possible to do more than simply survive a cross-cultural interaction or simply to learn survival social skills. An exchange with another culture may lead up to psychological growth and a better understanding of who we are, what we value, and where we might want to go. The specific aspects of the cross-cultural communication experience, therefore, present individuals with opportunities for exploring values, traits, attitudes, and identities that may not have surfaced, or may not have become as explicit and center stage, if they have not crossed the border and confronted a new socio-cultural environment. In other words, the encounter with another culture propels individuals to conduct critical inquiry and self-reflection. It posits the potential for learning and for experience that offers an invaluable opportunity to develop self-awareness and intercultural sensitivity, which can fundamentally transform the newcomers. In short, although an exchange with persons from other cultures can cause psychological disturbance, it, at the same time, offers a vehicle for personal growth.

In this research paradigm, cross-culture encounter and the anxiety accompanying the process are regarded as the functional elements that get individuals prepared to achieve self-transcendence and self-renewal. Several cross-cultural adaptational models have been developed to address various psychological stages an individual undergoes when immersed in a different culture over a long period of time. Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), for example, seeks to explain process of how people make sense of cultural differences, and to "diagnose stages of development for individuals or groups" [1: 24]. The central concepts in the DMIS theory are ethnocentrism and ethnorelativism. Bennett defines ethnocentrism as the assumption "that the worldview of one's own culture is central to all reality" [1:30], and ethnorelativism as the understanding that cultures are relative to one another within a cultural context [1: 46]. The model presents six stages that fall into one of those two domains. Three of these stages are identified as ethnocentric – Denial, Defense, and Minimization, and three others – Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration – are categorized as ethnorelative. Even though the developmental process is not linear, the model is thought of as a continuum where Denial is the stage with the least intercultural sensitivity and Integration the stage where the highest level of sensitivity is reached. Overall, Bennett's model presents the stages of intercultural sensitivity development, and provides a map to understand the processes of developing intercultural sensitivity and the challenges that it supposes. The shift from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism implies that individuals have overcome the impulse to place their own cultures as central to reality, and are willing to change their frames of reference according to the cultural context. This can finally help individuals to merge aspects of the other culture into one's own identity, thus becoming bi- or multicultural.

Another informative cross-cultural adaptation model was developed by Gudykunst, Kim [4]. In this model, the experience of newcomers in a host culture is illustrated by the four elements in the process of adaptation, namely – enculturation, deculturation, acculturation, and assimilation. Enculturation refers to the socialization of native cultural values and social behaviors prior to an individual's entry into the host culture. Entering into a new and unfamiliar culture and interacting in it, an individual goes through the process of resocialization, or acculturation. As acculturation takes place, an individual detects similarities and differences between home culture and host culture, and begins to acquire some of the host society's sociocultural norms and values. Almost simultaneous with the occurrence of acculturation is deculturation, which involves unlearning the old cultural pattern. As the dynamic concurrence of acculturation and deculturation continues, newcomers gradually undergo a cross-cultural adaptation process and change in the direction of assimilation. It is the final stage of the cross-cultural adaptation, which features a high degree of acculturation into the host milieu together with a high degree of deculturation of the native culture. Although the direction of cross-cultural adaptation is toward assimilation, conflict often occurs in the process

between the desire to acculturate to the new culture and the desire to retain the old and familiar one. Continuous interplay of acculturation and deculturation, as well as cyclical stress and adjustment, is a common experience of cross-cultural adaptation [5].

Intercultural socialization

The above cross-cultural adaptation models both indicate that when newcomers start a boundary-crossing journey, they will naturally and necessarily (although sometimes unconsciously) go through cross-cultural transformation. Through a continuous or prolonged intercultural contact with a new and unfamiliar languaculture, the newcomers experience intercultural socialization at different paces and with different intensity.

In this intercultural socialization process, challenged by the new cultural environment, second language learners tend to go through an internal transformation "in the direction of increasing fitness and compatibility in that environment" [5: 9]. During the procedure, learners constantly construe, validate, and reformulate the meaning of their cross-cultural experiences. When they discover that their primary meaning structures are ineffective, problematic or even conflictual when they attempt to reflect on or to integrate new knowledge or experience structures, they tend to conduct a critical self-examination to reassess or critique the presuppositions formed in their primary socialization, which leads them to renegotiate and reconstruct their orientation to cultural belief, values, and behaviors. On the basis of the reevaluation and repositioning, adaptive transformation occurs, which is a procedure of becoming critically aware of how and why their presuppositions have come to "manipulate" the way they perceive, understand, and feel the new world. In the ever-ongoing socializing/transforming process, learners may critically adjust themselves linguistically and socioculturally. Through the transformation, the learners gradually 1) expand their repertoire of language resources and social identities, 2) become more inclusive, discriminating, and integrating in cross-cultural perspectives, and 3) develop multiple lenses to view and make sense of their worlds. All these contribute to promote second language learners' cross-cultural sensitivity and their abilities to operate in different intercultural communication settings with appropriate, effective, and meaningful communicative performance.

In this complex process of intercultural socialization, cross-cultural transformation can occur with multiple facets and in multiple dimensions. For example, it can occur in the form of changes in perceptions, attitudes, and behavioral patterns; changes in linguistic proficiency and communicative competence; and changes in social, ethnic, or cultural identities. The communicative conventions of the learners' native languages and cultures are very likely to be transported across borders, which are infused with, corroded by and finally even replaced by newly constructed meanings and knowledge. All these changes are constituted by, as well as constitute the transformation in intercultural transition or adaptation. With more integrative cross-cultural perspectives and smoother communicative practices, second language learners will gradually rediscover a full-fledged intercultural self-identity, which may finally lead them to achieve legitimate participation in a new community [8].

Language socialization, as mentioned above, has been quite recently incorporated into the field of second language studies. Derived from anthropology, language socialization study is primarily required to maintain "ethnographic in design, longitudinal in perspective" [7: 350].

Intercultural transformation studies, on the contrary, have developed an extensive body of theoretical literature to probe the phenomenon of personal constructs, cognitive complexity, as well as transformational stages individuals go through on their way to becoming intercultural in multiple sociocultural contexts. Their inadequacy lies in its overwhelming emphasis on theoretical explanation and psychological assumption rather than empirical and concrete data demonstration of individuals' cross-cultural interactions during their longitudinal developmental processes. To overcome the problems and to ascertain the developmental changes of cross-cultural newcomers' adaptation both at the individual and cultural level, a longitudinal design is needed. Research methods with multiple, systematic assessments, which are conducted with the same sojourners over a period of time, will be essential.

Theoretically speaking, the language socialization study's emphasis on the interweaving relationship between language and culture itself has already been very complex and intricate. When it is introduced into the field of second language acquisition, this research paradigm's analytical power, originally derived from research on children's primary socialization, may not be comprehensive enough to explain cross-cultural newcomers' much more dynamic and elusive

behaviors in the host socio-cultural contexts. Despite its call for examining second language speakers' sociocultural behavior from both macro and micro levels, in the contexts of cross-cultural secondary socialization, language socialization has not provided adequate explanatory power at the macro level to interpret the constant competition between the coexisting home and host cultural systems, which imposes crucial impacts on cultural strangers' languacultural behavior. As a remedy for the underdevelopment of theoretical foundations in second language socialization studies, the introduction of intercultural communication, especially intercultural transformation theory, holds promise to provide systematic and well-developed theoretical support to analyze the struggle between individuals' acculturation and deculturation in their intercultural socialization process. The established cross-cultural adaptation models (Bennett, Gudykunst, Kim) offer indexes against which to examine newcomers' dynamic status and patterns of intercultural transformation.

By introducing intercultural communication theory into language socialization theory, we get better chances to explain at the macro cross-cultural level about how and why there appears "the acquisition (or not) of particular linguistic and cultural practices over time and across contexts" [7:350]. However, it is necessary to realize that intercultural communication theory has its inherent weaknesses, which happen to arise directly from its strengths. In order to increase our ability to interpret and predict border-crossers' behavior accurately, thereby decreasing the likelihood of misunderstanding, intercultural communication studies strive to understand dimensions of cultural variability. Such intention to look for regularities and generalizations jeopardizes the research to become formulistic. This tendency can be easily detected from the dichotomous terminologies prevail in cross-cultural communication studies, which have been popularized and have occupied dominant positions in the field.

Although the scholars in the field of intercultural communication studies are among the pioneers to argue against the defects of stereotyping cultural behavior, the generalizations and conceptualizations they solidify in their research may easily lead to stereotypical analysis of cross-cultural communicative behavior at another level. In the domain of communicative transformation, there exists a similar tendency of essentializing. Although the existing adaptation models are very revealing and enlightening, they, in different 'disguises', take an assimilationist tone to conceive of intercultural transformation as a one-dimensional change at the cost of newcomers' gradually losing their primary cultural heritage. Whereas Kim, Bennett and others do attend to the fluid nature of identity, the focus remains on the newcomers' efforts to adapt, their resilience and creativity to counterbalance the pressure imposed by cultural differences, and their ability to assimilate to achieve integration into the new cultural contexts. Little is said about the dominant culture's attitudes towards various forms of culture differences, which inevitably exert impact on sojourners' cross-cultural adaptive experiences. Taking an evolutionary to the point of almost deterministic view on sojourners' process of adaptation, culture strangers are expected to take on the characteristics of the dominant group in any way. Although various phases and modes of adaptation haven been identified, most of the intercultural adaptation studies conducted in the communication discipline have been milieu-free rather than context-embedded investigations.

Language socialization possesses a particular strength of recognizing both the constructive force of sociocultural contexts and individuals' capability of excising their own agencies or subjectivities. The emphasis on the constituting force of "discursive practices" helps focus our attention on the power relations prevail in sociocultural contexts and the subsequent dynamic aspects of intercultural encounters. Through this lens of examination, a person is not regarded as a static social product with fixed identity following a destined developmental trajectory, but as an individual emerges through the processes of social interaction, and one whose identity and personal development are constructed and reconstructed through various social practices in which they participate. Through conversational interaction and self-reflection, individuals go through discursive processes of "positioning" to exercise both continuity and multiplicity of selves, with "continuous personality" and "discontinuous personal diversity" [3: 46].

Within the language socialization framework, adaptation is envisioned as a process of negotiation situated within the prevailing power relations. Individuals are perceived to construct and reconstruct their social identities with localized tactics and power. By acquiescing, complying, contesting, and resisting "different range of available subject positions" [9: 123], individuals gradually extend their repertoire of identities and adaptation tactics. This allows them to take more flexible practices to locate their own notion and agenda of adequation (Bucholtz, Hall) or passing

(Piller). Under the hegemonic power of social structural order, individuals may adopt diverse passing tactics to scrutinize, question, resist and reinscribe the dominant culture tenets, and to seek the most favorable positions acceptable to the agents themselves as well as compatible with the sociocultural structure. Individuals' multiple and hybrid positionings, together with their diverse criteria for adequation, help us better understand their discursive degrees of identifying with the target languacultural group.

To achieve a more comprehensive understanding on intercultural socialization, we can 1) adopt the tenets of both research paradigms' reasoning on languacultural development; 2) employ longitudinal ethnographic research methodology; 3) use intercultural communication/transformation theory to explore intercultural socialization at the macro cross-cultural level, and 4) investigate diverse language practices by taking the intricate individual and contextual power relationship into consideration.

The feather research in this field can be seen in the investigating two domains in cross-cultural communication studies to create a more inclusive theoretical framework of intercultural language socialization. An elaboration of such a framework holds promise to enable a more panoramic interrogation of the joint development of second language learners' competence and sociocultural knowledge in complex cross-cultural communicative contexts.

LITERATURE

1. Bennett, J. M. (1993) Cultural marginality: Identity issues in intercultural training. In M. Paige (Ed.). *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp.109-135). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
2. Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2003). Language and identity. In A. Duranti (ed.) *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 369-394). UK: Blackwell.
3. Davies B. & Harre R. (1999) Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*. 20:43-63.
4. Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1997). *Communicating with Strangers: An approach to intercultural communication*. (3rd Ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.
5. Kim, Y. Y. (1988). *Communication and cross-cultural adaptation: An integrative theory*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
6. Kim, Y. Y. (2001) *Becoming intercultural: An integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation*. London: Sage Publications.
7. Kulick, D. & Schieffelin, B. B. (2004). Language socialization. A. Duranti (Ed), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349-368). Oxford: Blackwell.
8. Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated cognition: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
9. Pavlenko, A. (2001a). Bilingualism, gender and ideology. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5:2, 117-151.
10. Pavlenko, A. & Piller, I. (2001). New direction in the study of multilingualism, second language learning and gender. In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller, & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, second language learning, and gender* (pp. 17-43). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

ВІДОМОСТІ ПРО АВТОРА

Анжеліка Солодка – кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри іноземних мов Миколаївського державного університету.

Наукові інтереси: міжкультурна комунікація.

МЕХАНИЗМ ПОРОЖДЕННЯ МОДАЛЬНИХ СМЫСЛОВ ВЫСКАЗЫВАНИЯ

Анатолий УСТИНОВ (Анапа, Краснодарский край, Россия)

Статья посвящена вопросу изучения механизма порождения модальных смыслов высказывания. В начале статьи на основе гипотез И.А.Зимней и А.А.Леонтьева рассматриваются фазы порождения текста и возникновения модального замысла высказывания. Во второй части статьи представлены семантические операции, которые необходимы для формирования модальных смыслов высказывания. В заключение представлен алгоритм появления модального смысла, исходя из предложенной темы и условий протекания речевой деятельности.

The paper is devoted to the problem of studying modal senses of utterances and their outcome. Firstly stages of text result and outcome of utterances modal intention are regarded on the basis of hypothesis of Zimnyaya and Leontyev. In the second part of the article semantic operations are presented. They are necessary for utterances modal senses formation. Finally the algorithm of modal sense outcome is presented on the basis of the developed theme and conditions of speech activity.

Известны различные модели порождения речи (Л.С. Выготский, Н.И. Жинкин, И.А. Зимняя, Г.В. Колшанский, С.Д. Кацнельсон, Е.С. Кубрякова, А.А. Леонтьев, А.Р. Лурия, Н.Ф.Уфимцева и др.). Несмотря на различие подходов (лингвистического, психологического, лингвопсихологического) к определению структуры речепорождения важным является тот факт, что все модели имеют общие ключевые фазы. По мнению О.Л. Каменской, в качестве