

из наиболее важных аспектов реализации прагматической цели коммуникации – реализация влияния на реципиента.

Ключевые слова: контекст коммуникации, дискурс Интернет рекламы, коммуникативный процесс, коммуникация посредством компьютера, интертекстуальность.

Sokolova I. V. Context of communication as a component of communication process

Communication process and its components are objects of deep research for different sciences. Researches of different aspects of the process of communication are of great importance and make the topicality of our analysis. This article provides some results of investigation into the process of communication, namely processes of advertising discourse functioning in the context of the Internet. Internet advertising is defined as type of discourse with the following peculiar characteristics: clear pragmatic purpose; representation of the speech act participants by verbal and non-verbal means; up-to-date information; specific context of functioning. Internet advertising is mostly one-way communication process, though Internet environment provides the opportunity for interactivity. Internet provides great opportunities for combination of several perceptive effects – sound, text and image (so called multimedia features). Interactivity, combined with multimedia potential, provides enhanced opportunities for advertisements' perception and comprehension. Internet advertising discourse, one of the main constituent characteristics of which is functioning in specific environment – computer-mediated context, is considered to be one of the most effective in terms of producing complex influence on the recipient. Context of verbal communication is one of the main aspects for fulfilling pragmatic purpose of communication – the purpose of influence on the recipient.

Key words: context of communication, Internet advertising discourse, communication process, computer-mediated communication, intertextuality.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 20.01.2014 р.

Прийнято до друку 28.03.2014 р.

Рецензент – к. філол. н., доц. Дорда С. В.

УДК [316.6 : 316.72] – 054.6

M. A. Speranskaya-Skarga

**APPROACHES TO DEFINING CULTURE SHOCK IN
CROSS-CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY CONTEXT**

The notions of culture and foreign culture adjustment have always been the issues of research and consideration. Taking into account recent political,

economic and cultural changes, as well as globalization processes, the problem of cultures mingling and reciprocal influence are getting more and more actual.

Traditionally, culture has either been seen as a set of symbolic meanings located in the minds of people or been defined as a context variable. Most authors in the field of cross-cultural psychology now follow the notion that culture can be very broadly defined as the human-made part of the environment consisting of both objective elements (e.g. tools, roads, housing), and subjective elements, or a “group’s characteristic way of perceiving its social environment” [1]. The subjective view includes a multidimensional array of shared beliefs, norms, and values of a particular group that are instantiated in everyday social practices and institutions, and that have been historically cultivated, transmitted, and deemed functional across time. Thus, cultures are seen as both products of past behavior and as shapers of future behavior and at the same time, humans are seen as producers of culture and are being influenced by it [2].

Culture has long been regarded as a phenomenon restricted to national borders. The tendency to mistakenly equate culture with nation or ethnic group is now increasingly challenged. Rather than focusing on geographical differences, numerous dimensions of cultural variation have been empirically derived. It is believed that any nation or subgroup in a nation may be characterized by a distinct cultural value pattern, profile or cultural standard [3]. Recent approaches comprehend cultures as “dynamic open systems that spread across geographical boundaries and evolve through time” [4] rather than stable and static entities.

Historical records demonstrate that interaction with other cultures is not a new phenomenon. Nevertheless, it should be noted that this interaction has reached unprecedented heights in recent decades. The processes of culture exchange and influence can be presently observed in all spheres of modern society: either in economy, tourism, or in politics and even education. As the world has definitely become ‘smaller’, the problems of multiculturalism, globalization, and foreign culture adjustment need consideration.

Thus, the objective of the article is to specify the peculiarities of the process of foreign culture adjustment and to define the phenomenon of culture shock in the context of cross-cultural psychology.

Cross-cultural communication has emerged as a major concern in our multicultural society. Much has been written about recognizing the cultural biases inherent in all problem-solving and development models as well as improving communication between cultural groups. There are some situations, however, where culture itself is the problem rather than simply a communication obstacle to be overcome between client and worker.

Culture can be understood as a network of shared meanings that are taken for granted as reality by those interacting within the network. This view of culture proposes that a community of people tend to construct a common model or map of the world derived from their shared experiences and then use these pre-determined categories as a background or setting against which

incoming experiences are interpreted. Without such a model or map, people would experience the world as totally chaotic and unpredictable. In addition to traditional behaviors and customs, culture then includes a conceptual style which 'reflects more a manner of organizing things, of putting things in a certain way, of looking at the world in a distinct fashion' [5, p. 42]. People attempt to structure the outside world by matching external stimuli against internal conceptual patterns. When such a match is made, the person is able to give meaning to an outside event. If the match cannot be made, however, the person may feel disoriented, frustrated, or afraid. In order to survive and manage in our world, we must develop a useful set of expectations which allow us to interact with our social environment to meet our needs.

Vastly different patterns of experience over time will result in vastly different world views or background assumptions. People with different cultures will perceive the world differently because they have been 'selectively sensitized to certain arrays of stimuli rather than others as a function of membership in one cultural group rather than another' [6, p. 168]. As long as a person is interacting with others who share the same world view, he or she may not consciously be aware of the particular patterns of meaning assumed. The shared reality is simply taken for granted. It is through contact with persons who see the world differently that an individual can become acutely aware of the cultural patterns he or she is using.

Cross-cultural interaction poses the situation where assumption of reciprocal perspectives is no longer valid, where there is no consensus about reality, where the background expectancies are not shared. In this situation, a person may experience frustration and disorientation as predictions break down, incoming stimuli do not match familiar patterns, and actions are misinterpreted by others.

When people move to a new culture they take with them the taken-for-granted meaning structure of their home culture. They continue to choose actions consistent with it, and to interpret their own and their host's actions in terms of it [7, p. 133]. Therefore, conflicts related to the differences in rules, meanings, and values between the two cultures will be inevitable.

Foundations of cross-cultural training research can be traced back to the 1950s [8; 9]. Cross-cultural training emerged to prevent the so-called culture shock, "an occupational disease of people who have suddenly been transported abroad" [10, p. 177]. It was not until the 1970s however, that cross-cultural training programmes were consolidated as "cross-cultural or intercultural orientation programmes", designed for preparing people for living in another culture.

Increasing globalization and internationalization characterize today and tomorrow in the industrial world. Although globalization opens many opportunities, it also creates complex challenges. An important challenge is understanding and appreciating cultural values, practices, and subtleties in different parts of the world. All the experts in international business agree that to succeed in global business, managers need the flexibility to respond

positively and effectively to practices and values that may be different from what they are accustomed to. It requires the ability to be open to others' ideas and opinions. As the global market is growing and becoming highly competitive, industrial and organizational psychology also needs to become more globally oriented. Joint ventures and multinational enterprises form the contact zones in which people from different cultural backgrounds meet. Cultural standards serve the function of criteria for judging and regulating one's own behavior and that of others.

Cross-cultural industrial and organizational psychology needs to tackle a wide variety of questions that have until now been rather neglected. First, do organizations located in different countries differ with respect to organizational characteristics, behavior of members or the interrelationship between these two, and second, can these differences be explained in terms of culture? What are the specifics and what are the universals in organizations across culture with special regard to cultural standards? It is the task of psychologists to develop and provide training and learning tools that accompany the process of acculturation. A knowledge base of reliable cross-cultural differences in perceptions, beliefs, or modes of information processing should be built to help with the creation of integrative bargaining solutions in cross-national negotiation [1].

Drenth proposes that an intriguing question in cross-cultural industrial and organizational psychology is whether globalization leads to a more common organizational culture world wide and to increased convergence. In order to answer this question, research on cultural variables and behavior in the organizational context (e.g. managerial thinking, leadership, negotiation) will be reviewed [2]. It is argued that organizational practices and the way these are worked out, perceived, and appreciated across countries, are still quite dissimilar.

Undoubtedly the most commonly used dimension to explain cross-cultural differences in behavior is that of individualism-collectivism. Measured in a variety of ways, cultural differences on the individualism-collectivism continuum have been used to explain differences in risk preference, career preferences, causal attributions, social responsibility, decision making and risk adjustment, definitions and constructions of the self, and judgment of one's own and others' performances, to name only a few.

As we may see, the studies of the theory of culture adjustment are closely related to the notion of culture shock. Culture shock is now being treated as an active process of dealing with change rather than a passive reaction to a noxious set of circumstances. There has been introduced a model for culture shock that comprises affective, behavioral, and cognitive components.

Although some of the affective components of culture shock (e.g. anxiety, confusion, disorientation) resemble its original representation, many authors have highlighted the significance of coping factors that reduce the distress of culture contact (e.g. self-efficacy, social support).

The behavioral component of culture shock is associated with the concept of culture learning, with its core idea that rules and conventions that regulate interpersonal interactions that vary across cultures. It has been proposed by different authors that one reason for culture shock is that sojourners break norms and receive negative reactions from hosts, but do not exactly know why. This is where cultural standards enter the scene.

The concept of cultural standards, as it has been introduced by Thomas, refers to core characteristics of a culture-specific orientation system that embrace all kinds of perception, thinking, evaluating, and acting that most members of one culture regard as normal and appropriate for themselves and for others [11]. Cultural standards serve the function of criteria for judging and regulating one's own behavior and that of others. This notion of culture can be used in the development of culture-specific assimilators that help expatriates to acquire basic social skills through behavioral culture training, mentoring and learning about the historical, philosophical and sociopolitical foundations of the host society.

The third component, the cognitive component, refers to the notion that culture consists of shared meanings. When cultures come into contact, irreconcilable positions affect the perceptions and interpersonal beliefs of participants. As far as the response to second culture influences is concerned, there are two distinct theoretical positions. Firstly, as predicted by Berry's acculturation model [8], individuals can respond by becoming more ethnocentric, by assimilating and becoming more monocultural, by becoming bicultural, or by vacillating between both cultures and not identifying with either.

Secondly, the attention of the scholars was focused on biculturalism and put forward that people can in fact switch between cultural frames that are evoked by cultural elements in their surrounding environment [12]. However, the development of a bicultural, mediating identity might only be adaptive in societies that genuinely value cultural diversity. The notion of a multicultural society is a relatively recent development [11]. Significant contributions to within-society ethnic diversity have been the increase in immigration and refugee movements as well as the gradual elimination of race as a criterion for admitting or excluding immigrants. For a society to be truly multicultural, however, the "mutuality of accommodation" must be acknowledged and it must be recognized that both newcomers and members of the receiving society change as a result of contact.

The term of culture shock is often related to the context of globalization and modern perceptions of the world as "the global village" [5; 10]. The term global village is widely used to refer to the ability of the mass media to bring events from all corners of the globe to our own lounge rooms. This concept has been extended to one of globalization – i.e. time-space compression means that intercultural contact is ever-present and immediate. Boundaries (especially of time and space) are shrinking. Certainly, in terms of physical accessibility, cultural boundaries are shrinking. But whilst globalization has removed some of the mystique, indeed shock, of other

cultures, the process of adjusting to life in another culture can never be eliminated. Time and space are probably the only two constants across all cultures. All other aspects of life remain culturally unique.

Whilst the experiences associated with culture shock are not new, the term itself is less than half a century old. An anthropologist, Oberg, has been credited with coining the term in 1960. He defined it in the following way: "Culture shock is precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse. These signs or cues include the thousand and one ways in which we orient ourselves to the situations of daily life...All of us depend for our peace of mind and our efficacy on hundreds of these cues, most of which we are not consciously aware..." [10].

In fact as the term culture shock itself suggests, most definitions are negatively oriented. According to Brown, '...culture shock refers to phenomena ranging from mild irritability to deep psychological panic and crisis' [12, P. 128]. It has been also suggested that the second language learner suffering from culture shock experiences '...disorientation, stress, fear, etc. as a result of differences between his or her own culture and that of the target language community...' [12, P. 252]. At perhaps its most negative, culture shock has been likened to schizophrenia where '...social encounters become inherently threatening, and defence mechanisms are employed to reduce the trauma' [12, P. 130]. Such perspectives, spawned from sociological and psychological bases and with their emphasis on emotional responses, undoubtedly raise fear in those about to undertake an overseas position. Clearly, intense emotional and mental energy is expended in intercultural interactions in order to prevent communication breakdown. Taken in isolation, these intercultural interactions might not seem so significant, but when so many demands are made over a short period of time, it eventually leads to overload [4; 9]. Yet, it is believed that by perceiving culture shock as an opportunity for personal growth, the negative connotations implied by most of the definitions, can be minimized. Similarly, what is largely perceived from an emotional perspective can be 'turned around' to be viewed from an intellectual perspective. It doesn't take away the experience, it just changes it. In this vein, Adler prefers to view culture shock as '...a continuum of experience', during which self-development and personal growth may occur [6].

As for the effects of culture shock it is essential to state the following. The increase in intercultural communication over recent decades has been matched by an increase in the research of such. Numerous studies attest to the existence and effects of culture shock, although the focus has varied from language to physical symptoms, from emotional reactions to role ambiguity [6]. More recently, the attention of researchers has been focused upon training/skills programs that might help minimize the adverse effects of culture shock [3; 4; 9]. The pattern of research then, validates the existence of culture shock and acknowledges its pivotal role in intercultural communication.

Culture shock is usually described as occurring in a number of stages. These stages are characterized by either a 'U' shape or 'W' shape, depending

upon the number of stages included. Schnell describes four stages: the honeymoon, crisis, resolution and stabilization. Brown prefers to describe this entire process as acculturation, with the second stage being classified as culture shock [12]. Whatever the number of stages included or the shape assigned, a similar pattern emerges. This pattern moves from positive experiences to negative experiences, then back to positive. It must be pointed out, however, that while this is the 'normal' pattern, there is a danger in generalizing. Some people, for example, may never progress past the first stage of negative experiences. The first stage is generally one of euphoria, where the new culture is seen as exciting and exotic. Sometimes this stage is referred to as the 'honeymoon stage'. This is the top of the 'U' shape. Understandably, few people have difficulty with this stage.

The second stage is generally one of greatest difficulty. This is when the 'honeymoon' is over and the differences in culture start to bring frustrations, stress, anxiety and even regret. Feelings of disorientation, sadness and homelessness are often felt. People begin to struggle with their true identity which seems to have been obscured or lost in the immersion in this new culture. This is the bottom of the 'U' shape.

The third stage (sometimes broken into two distinct parts) is typified by mixed emotions and can be labeled as a 'resolution' stage. It is during this time that crises (particularly in self-identity) characteristically occur. Such crises usually result in greater self-awareness. During this stage adjustments begin to occur. After some resolution to the crisis the new culture is no longer viewed as a threat. Greater cultural awareness and understanding begin to emerge. This stage reaches its peak at the top of the 'U' shape, where people begin to see themselves and others as cultural beings. This is basically the 'uphill run' or a 'stabilization' stage. Some see the culture shock pattern as repeating itself and thus forming a 'W' shape rather than a 'U' shape. This occurs where people, upon re-entering their own culture, experience similar symptoms of disorientation and stress and finally re-adjust.

Perhaps the single most important understanding to emerge from this discussion of culture shock is that it is unnecessary to 'fast forward' through the stages, that even to wish to do so is denying yourself an invaluable 'growth' experience. Understanding what is happening to us, why it is happening to us and trusting in the outcome must be an empowering experience. People need support and acknowledgment of their feelings, not judgment. 'Failure' to adjust to living in another culture is costly, certainly emotionally and physically for those involved. However, financial cost is increasingly becoming a concern, especially as more and more companies spend great amounts of money financing overseas assignments. It is this, perhaps more than anything else, that has prompted a recent focus on preventative measures.

We have come to the conclusion that culture is an inherent part of the social world that reflects either viewpoints, or behavior and the selection of social patterns. From the moment of birth, people are continuously educated

and socialized as to the culturally appropriate linguistic, cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills necessary to engage in proper, socially sanctioned behaviors. As individuals develop and learn more about their own culture, this knowledge becomes deeply ingrained and automatized, helping them make sense of their social environment and coordinate their behavior with others from the same culture with relatively little effort. These socialization experiences then predispose individuals to respond to environmental cues in culturally normative ways.

Although culture-specific knowledge is useful in simplifying the social world and allowing individuals to coordinate their behavior with each other, culture can also constrain a number of psychological processes, potentially impairing novelty and innovation. Because culture consists of routinized responses and knowledge structures, it can make familiar and common psychological responses highly salient, thereby obstructing obtaining and retrieving novel ideas.

Thus, culture serves both as a coordination device and as a constraint of thought and behavior. Similar processes occur when culture has to be attained by people traditionally belonging to another one with its own sets of norms, behavioral principles etc.

Considering the peculiarities of culture shock as a psychological phenomenon leads to the necessity to reveal the essential strategies of coping with the problem in the further research.

References

- 1. Bontempo R. N.** Cross-cultural differences in risk perception / R. N. Bontempo, W. P. Bottom, E. U. Weber // *A model-based approach. Risk Analysis*, 17, 1997. – P. 479 – 488.
- 2. Drenth P. J.** European perspectives in psychology / P. J. Drenth, J. A. Sergeant, R. J. Takens. – New York, NY: John Wiley, 1990. – 250 p.
- 3. O’Sullivan K.** Understanding ways: Communicating between cultures / K. O’Sullivan. – Sydney : Hale & Iremonger, 1994. – 145 p.
- 4. Bochner S.** Power distance, individualism/collectivism, and job related attitudes in a culturally diverse work group / S. Bochner, B. Hesketh // *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25, 1994. – P. 233 – 257.
- 5. Price-William D. R.** Cross-, intra-, inter-, and just plain cultural / D. R. Price-William : In W. J. Lonner & D. L. Dinnel (Eds.), *Merging past, present, and future in cross-cultural psychology: Selected papers from the Fourteenth International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1999. – P. 40 –45.
- 6. Adler N. J.** Re-entry: Managing cross-cultural transitions. *Group and Organization Studies* 6(3) / N. J. Adler : Hillsdale, NJ, 1981. – 356 p.
- 7. Norenzayan A.** Culture and causal cognition / A. Norenzayan, R. E. Nisbett // *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 2000. – P. 132 – 135.
- 8. Berry J. W.** *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications* / J. W. Berry, Y. H. Poortinga, M. H. Segall, P. R. Dasen : Cambridge University Press, 1992. – 420 p.
- 9. Brislin R. W.** *Intercultural Interactions: A Practice Guide* / R. W. Brislin, K. Cushner, C. Cherrie, M. Yong : Beverly Hills, 1986. –

158 p. **10. Oberg K.** Culture shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments / K. Oberg // *Practical Anthropology*, 7, 1960. – P. 177 – 182. **11. Thomas A.** Comparison of managing cultural diversity in German-Chinese research and business cooperation / A. Thomas // In W. J. Lonner & D. L. Dinnel (Eds.), *Merging past, present, and future in cross-cultural psychology: Selected papers from the Fourteenth International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1999. – P. 520 – 531. **12. Brown H. D.** Principles of language learning and teaching / H. D. Brown. – New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc, 1987. – 306 p.

Сперанська-Скарга М. А. Підходи до визначення культурного шоку в контексті крос-культурної психології

У статті розглянуто особливості процесу адаптації до іноземної культури та визначено поняття культурного шоку з позицій крос-культурної психології. Автором доведено, що культура є невід'ємною частиною соціального світу, яка відображає погляди, поведінку та низку моделей соціальної взаємодії. Незважаючи на те, що знання щодо культури певного народу є вкрай важливими у процесі спрощення соціальних стосунків, культура також може представляти низку психологічних процесів, що потенційно здатні погіршувати та уповільнювати інноваційну діяльність. Оскільки культура складається з традиційної психологічної та когнітивної структури, вона здатна зробити знайомі психологічні відгуки такими, що перешкоджають сприйняттю нових ідей. Культура виконує роль координаційного інструменту, але також може бути причиною скутості думки та поведінки людини. Зазначено також, що культурний шок – це той феномен, який впливає на людей у різні способи та ступені. Було зроблено припущення, що засади вироблення механізму подолання культурного шоку пов'язані зі здатністю послідовно визначати стадії культурного шоку та долати їх.

Автор доходить висновку, що шляхом розуміння процесу пристосування індивід може очікувати на культурний стрес та шок, що, у свою чергу, сприяє мінімізації психологічних реакцій та призводить до більш глибокого розуміння й інтеграції у нову культуру.

Ключові слова: іноземна культура, культурний шок, адаптація до іноземної культури, крос-культурна психологія, міжнаціональна взаємодія.

Сперанская-Скарга М. А. Подходы к определению культурного шока в контексте кросс-культурной психологии

В статье рассмотрены особенности процесса адаптации к иностранной культуре и определено понятие культурного шока с позиций кросс-культурной психологии. Автор подчеркивает, что культура является неотъемлемой частью социального мира, которая отображает взгляды, поведение и ряд моделей социального взаимодействия. Несмотря на то, что знания в области культуры определенного народа играют важную роль в процессе упрощения

социальных отношений, культура также может представлять ряд психологических процессов, потенциально способных ухудшать и замедлять инновационную деятельность. Таким образом, культура выполняет функцию координации, однако также может быть причиной скованности мысли и поведения человека. В статье определено, что культурный шок – это феномен, который влияет на людей в различной степени. Было сделано предположение, что условия формирования механизма преодоления культурного шока связаны со способностью последовательно определять стадии культурного шока и преодолевать их.

Автором сделан вывод, что осознание основных особенностей процесса адаптации способствует тому, что индивид ожидает возникновения культурного стресса и шока, что, в свою очередь, приводит к минимизации негативных психологических реакций, более глубокому пониманию и интегрированию в новую культуру.

Ключевые слова: иностранная культура, культурный шок, адаптация к иностранной культуре, кросс-культурная психология, межнациональное взаимодействие.

Speranskaya-Skarga M. A. Approaches to defining culture shock in cross-cultural psychology context

The author makes an attempt to reveal the peculiarities of the process of foreign culture adjustment and to define the phenomenon of culture shock from the viewpoint of cross-cultural psychology. It has been proved that culture is an inherent part of the social world that reflects either viewpoints, or behavior and the selection of social patterns. Although culture-specific knowledge is useful in simplifying the social world and allowing individuals to coordinate their behavior with each other, culture can also constrain a number of psychological processes, potentially impairing novelty and innovation. Because culture consists of routinized responses and knowledge structures, it can make familiar and common psychological responses highly salient, thereby obstructing obtaining and retrieving novel ideas. Thus, culture serves both as a coordination device and as a constraint of thought and behavior. It has been stated that culture shock is a phenomenon that affects people in different ways and in varying degrees. An implication has been made that the key to dealing successfully with culture shock rests with being able to recognize the stages of culture shock as they are being experienced.

The author has drawn the conclusion that by understanding the process of adjustment one can anticipate stress and this helps minimize the severity of reactions and leads to deeper understanding and integrating into the new culture.

Key words: foreign culture, culture shock, foreign culture adjustment, cross-cultural psychology, cross-national interaction.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 11.01.2014 р.

Прийнято до друку 28.03.2014 р.

Рецензент – к. філол. н., доц. Савельєва Н. О.